arXiv:math/0605734v2 [math.AG] 11 Oct 2007

Determinantal Characterization of Canonical Curves and Combinatorial Theta Identities

Marco Matone and Roberto Volpato

Dipartimento di Fisica "G. Galilei" and Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare
Università di Padova, Via Marzolo, 8 – 35131 Padova, Italy

Canonical curves are characterized by the vanishing of combinatorial products of $g+1$ determinants of the holomorphic abelian differentials. This also implies the characterization of canonical curves in terms of $(g-2)(g-3)/2$ theta identities and the explicit expression of the volume form on the moduli space of canonical curves induced by the Siegel metric.

Contents

1. Introduction . . . 2
2. Distinguished bases of $H^0(K_C^n)$ and relations among holomorphic differentials . . . 6
  2.1. Identities induced by the isomorphism $\mathbb{C}^{M_n} \leftrightarrow \mathrm{Sym}^n\mathbb{C}^g$ . . . 7
  2.2. A distinguished basis of $H^0(K_C^2)$ . . . 10
  2.3. Relations among holomorphic quadratic differentials . . . 12
  2.4. A distinguished basis of $H^0(K_C^3)$ . . . 15
  2.5. Relations among holomorphic cubic differentials . . . 16
3. Combinatorics of determinants . . . 19
4. Determinantal relations and combinatorial θ identities . . . 22
  4.1. Riemann theta functions and prime form . . . 23
  4.2. Determinants and theta functions on algebraic curves . . . 24
  4.3. Combinatorial theta identities on the canonical curve . . . 29
5. Siegel metric on $\hat{\mathcal{M}}_g$ and Mumford isomorphism . . . 34
  5.1. Combinatorial identities and the Mumford isomorphism . . . 37

1. Introduction

Petri's Theorem [1] determines the ideal of canonical curves of genus $g \geq 4$ by means of relations among holomorphic differentials (see also [2][3]). As emphasized by Mumford, Petri's relations are fundamental and should have basic applications (pg.241 of [4]). A feature of Petri's relations is that the holomorphic quadratic differentials he introduced depend on the choice of points. Furthermore, the coefficients of Petri's relations have not been written explicitly and no relations in terms of theta functions have been derived. Such a result would lead to a characterization of the Jacobian that, unlike the known solutions of the Schottky problem, would be linear in nature. Such a characterization should select modular forms vanishing on the Jacobian, a basic issue in the Schottky problem.

In the present paper, it is shown that the $(g-2)(g-3)/2$ linearly independent relations derived by Petri admit an intrinsic characterization based on combinatorial properties of determinants, which in turn imply a characterization of canonical curves in terms of theta identities. Remarkably, we will see that Petri's relations exactly match in a combinatorial formulation expressed as a sum on permutations of products of determinants of any basis of $H^0(K_C)$.

A feature of the formulation is that in the construction we use bases of $H^0(K_C^n)$, $n = 1, 2, 3$, which are manifestly modular invariant. This has several advantages and leads to a natural identification of a modular invariant basis of the fiber of $T^*\hat{\mathcal{T}}_g$, with $\mathcal{T}_g$ the Torelli space of canonical curves. This in turn provides the explicit characterization of the volume form $d\nu_{|\hat{\mathcal{M}}_g}$ on the moduli space $\hat{\mathcal{M}}_g$ of canonical curves, induced by the Siegel metric.

Let us introduce some notation before formulating the main results. Consider a smooth closed Riemann surface C of genus g; in general, we will only consider the case of a non-hyperelliptic surface of genus $g \geq 3$ and we will identify such a surface with the corresponding non-singular canonical curve in a projective space. For each $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, set

$$N_n := h^0(K_C^n) = (2n-1)(g-1) + \delta_{n1} \ , \qquad M_n := \binom{g+n-1}{n} \ ,$$

with $M := M_2$ and $N := N_2$. Set $I_n := \{1, \ldots, n\}$ and let $\mathcal{P}_n$ be the group of permutations of n symbols. We fix a bijection $I_M \ni i \mapsto \mathtt{1}_i\mathtt{2}_i \in I_g \times I_g/\mathcal{P}_2$ from I_M to the symmetrized product $I_g \times I_g/\mathcal{P}_2$. The details are given in subsection 2.1.

Let $\{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_g, \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_g\}$ be a symplectic basis of $H_1(C, \mathbb{Z})$ and denote by $\{\omega_i\}_{i \in I_g}$ the basis of $H^0(K_C)$ satisfying the standard normalization condition $\oint_{\alpha_i} \omega_j = \delta_{ij}$, and by $\tau_{ij} := \oint_{\beta_i} \omega_j$ the Riemann period matrix, $i, j \in I_g$. For each divisor d of degree $n(g-1)$, $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, consider the Riemann theta function (see section 4) $\theta_\Delta(d) := \theta(I(d) - nI(\Delta))$, where I is the Jacobi map and Δ is the Riemann divisor class. Set $\theta_{\Delta,i}(e) := \partial_{z_i}\theta_\Delta(z)_{|z=e}$, for all $e \in \mathbb{C}^g$, and denote by $E(x, y)$ the prime form. We denote by Θ the theta divisor and by Θ_s its singular component. Consider the space C_n of effective divisors of degree n; let W_n be the image $I(C_n)$ in the Jacobi variety $J_0(C)$. Denote by $W_n^r \subseteq W_n$, $r \geq 0$, the image of the divisors $d \in C_n$ with index of specialty $i(d) := h^0(K_C \otimes \mathcal{O}(-d)) \geq g - n + r$, and observe that $W_n^0 \equiv W_n$.

Set

$$S(x_1 + \ldots + x_g) := \frac{\theta_\Delta(\sum_1^g x_i - y)}{\sigma(y)\prod_1^g E(y, x_i)} \ ,$$

for all $y, x_1, \ldots, x_g \in C$, where σ is the holomorphic section of a trivial bundle on C introduced in subsection 4.1. S is independent of y (see Proposition 4.2). For each $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, let $\{\phi_i^n\}_{i \in I_{N_n}}$ be an arbitrary basis of $H^0(K_C^n)$. It is known that

$$\kappa[\phi^1] := \frac{\det \phi_i^1(p_j)}{S(\sum_1^g p_i)\prod_1^g \sigma(p_i)\prod_{i<j} E(p_i,p_j)} \ ,$$
$$\kappa[\phi^n] = \frac{\det \phi_i^n(p_j)}{\theta_\Delta(\sum_1^{N_n} p_i)\prod_1^{N_n} \sigma(p_i)^{2n-1}\prod_{i<j}^{N_n} E(p_i,p_j)} \ , \qquad n>1 \ ,$$

are independent of $p_1,\ldots,p_{N_n}\in C$ (Proposition 4.2). Denote by $\mathcal{A}\subset C^g := C\times\ldots\times C$ the locus of g-tuples of points $(p_1,\ldots,p_g)$ such that $\det\eta_i(p_j)=0$. $\mathcal{A}$ is the union of the hyperplanes $p_i=p_j$, $i\neq j\in I_g$, and of the set of points such that $p_1+\ldots+p_g$ is a special divisor, that is such that $I(p_1+\ldots+p_g)\in W_g^1$. In the following, for each fixed g-tuple of points $(p_1,\ldots,p_g)\in C^g$, we define the divisors $C_g\ni \mathrm{a}:=\sum_{i=1}^g p_i$, $C_{g-2}\ni \mathrm{b}:=\sum_{i=3}^g p_i$, $\mathrm{a}_i:=\mathrm{a}-p_i$, $i\in I_g$.

Theorem 1.1. *Let C be a canonical curve of genus $g\geq 4$ and $\{\omega_i\}_{i\in I_g}$ the canonically normalized basis of $H^0(K_C)$, and fix distinct points $p_3,\ldots,p_g\in C$ such that $K(p_3,\ldots,p_g)\neq 0$, with K defined in Eq.(4.39). Then, the ideal of C is generated by the $(g-2)(g-3)/2$ independent relations*

$$\sum_{s\in\mathcal{P}_{2g}}\epsilon(s)\det\omega(x_{s_1},\ldots,x_{s_g})\det\omega(x_{s_g},\ldots,x_{s_{2g-1}})\det\omega(x_{s_1},x_{s_{g+1}},x_{s_{2g}},p_3,\ldots,\check{p}_i,\ldots,p_g)$$
$$\cdot\det\omega(x_{s_2},x_{s_{g+2}},x_{s_{2g}},p_3,\ldots,\check{p}_j,\ldots,p_g)\prod_{k=3}^{g-1}\det\omega(x_{s_k},x_{s_{k+g}},p_3,\ldots,p_g)=0\ , \tag{1.1}$$

$3\leq i<j\leq g$, for all $x_k\in C$, $1\leq k\leq 2g$, unless C is trigonal or isomorphic to a smooth plane quintic.

The above relations can be directly expressed in terms of theta functions.

Theorem 1.2. *Fix $g-2$ distinct points $p_3,\ldots,p_g\in C$ in such a way that $K(p_3,\ldots,p_g)\neq 0$. The following $(g-2)(g-3)/2$ independent relations*

$$V_{i_1i_2}(p_3,\ldots,p_g,x_1,\ldots,x_{2g}) :=$$

$$\sum_{s\in\mathcal{P}_{2g}}\epsilon(s)\Big\{\prod_{k=1}^{2}\frac{S(\hat{x}_k+\hat{x}_{g+k}+\hat{x}_{2g}+\mathrm{b}-p_{i_k})E(\hat{x}_k,\hat{x}_{2g})E(\hat{x}_{k+g},\hat{x}_{2g})}{E(\hat{x}_k,p_{i_k})E(\hat{x}_{k+g},p_{i_k})E(\hat{x}_{2g},p_{i_k})}$$
$$\cdot\prod_{k=1}^{g-1}\big(E(\hat{x}_k,\hat{x}_{k+g})\prod_{j=3}^{g}E(\hat{x}_k,p_j)E(\hat{x}_{k+g},p_j)\big) \tag{1.2}$$
$$\cdot S\big(\sum_{k=1}^{g}\hat{x}_k\big)\prod_{\substack{k,j=1\\k<j}}^{g}E(\hat{x}_k,\hat{x}_j)S\big(\sum_{k=g}^{2g-1}\hat{x}_k\big)\prod_{\substack{k,j=g\\k<j}}^{2g-1}E(\hat{x}_k,\hat{x}_j)$$
$$\cdot\prod_{k=3}^{g-1}S(\hat{x}_k+\hat{x}_{k+g}+\mathrm{b})\prod_{j=3}^{g}E(\hat{x}_{2g},p_j)^2\Big\}=0\ ,$$

$3\leq i_1<i_2\leq g$, where $\hat{x}_i:=x_{s_i}$, $i\in I_{2g}$, hold for all $x_i\in C$, $i\in I_{2g}$.

By a limiting procedure we derive the original Petri's relations, now written in terms of the canonical basis $\omega_1,\ldots,\omega_g$ and with the coefficients expressed in terms of theta functions.

Corollary 1.3. *Fix $(p_1,\ldots,p_g)\in C^g\setminus\mathcal{A}$, with $K(p_3,\ldots,p_g)\neq 0$. The following $(g-2)(g-3)/2$ linearly independent relations*

$$\sum_{j=1}^{M} C^{\omega}_{ij}\omega\omega_j(z):=\frac{\kappa[\sigma]}{\kappa[v]}^{g+1}F(p,x)\frac{V_{\mathfrak{1}_i\mathfrak{2}_i}(p_3,\ldots,p_g,x_1,\ldots,x_{2g-1},z)}{\theta_\Delta\big(\sum_1^{2g-1}x_j+\mathrm{b}\big)}=0\ , \tag{1.3}$$

$N+1\leq i\leq M$, where

$$F(p,x):=c'_{g,2}\frac{\prod_{\substack{j,k=3\\ j<k}}^{g}E(p_j,p_k)^{g-4}\prod_{\substack{j=3\\ j\neq\mathfrak{1}_i}}^{g}E(p_{\mathfrak{1}_i},p_j)\prod_{\substack{j=3\\ j\neq\mathfrak{2}_i}}^{g}E(p_{\mathfrak{2}_i},p_j)}{\prod_{j=1}^{2g-1}(\sigma(x_j)\prod_{k=3}^{g}E(x_j,p_k)\prod_{k=j+1}^{2g-1}E(x_j,x_k))}\ ,$$

hold for all $z\in C$. Furthermore, C^{ω}_{ij} are independent of $p_1,p_2,x_1,\ldots,x_{2g-1}\in C$ and correspond to the coefficients defined in (2.32) (with $\eta_i\equiv\omega_i$, $i\in I_g$) or, equivalently, in (4.21).

Here, $c'_{g,2}$ is the integer constant defined in Lemma 3.3 and $\{\sigma_i\}_{i\in I_g}$ and $\{v_i\}_{i\in I_N}$ are the distinguished bases of, respectively, $H^0(K_C)$ and $H^0(K_C^2)$, introduced in section 2; such bases depend on the choice of $p_1,\ldots,p_g\in C$.

Fix g distinct points $p_1,\ldots,p_g\in C$ such that $K(p_3,\ldots,p_g)\neq 0$. The set $\{p_i\}_{i\in I_g}$ naturally corresponds to a modular invariant basis of the fiber of $T^*\hat{\mathcal{T}}_g$, with $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_g$ the Torelli space of canonical curves.

Theorem 1.4. *If $p_1,\ldots,p_g\in C$ are g pairwise distinct points such that $K(p_3,\ldots,p_g)\neq 0$, then*

$$\Xi_i:=\sum_{j=1}^{M}X^{\omega}_{ji}d\tau_j\ , \tag{1.4}$$

$i\in I_N$, with (see Eq.(4.19))

$$X^{\omega}_{ij}=\frac{\theta_{\Delta,\mathfrak{1}_j}(\mathrm{a}_{\mathfrak{1}_i})\theta_{\Delta,\mathfrak{2}_j}(\mathrm{a}_{\mathfrak{2}_i})+\theta_{\Delta,\mathfrak{1}_j}(\mathrm{a}_{\mathfrak{2}_i})\theta_{\Delta,\mathfrak{2}_j}(\mathrm{a}_{\mathfrak{1}_i})}{(1+\delta_{\mathfrak{1}_j\mathfrak{2}_j})\sum_{l,m}\theta_{\Delta,l}(\mathrm{a}_{\mathfrak{1}_i})\theta_{\Delta,m}(\mathrm{a}_{\mathfrak{2}_i})\omega_l(p_{\mathfrak{1}_i})\omega_m(p_{\mathfrak{2}_i})}\ ,$$

$i,j\in I_M$, is a modular invariant basis of the fiber of $T^*\hat{\mathcal{T}}_g$ at the point representing C.

The above results fix the $(g-2)(g-3)/2$ linear relations satisfied by $d\tau_{ij}$. Furthermore (see subsection 2.1 for the notation)

Corollary 1.5. *The volume form on $\hat{\mathcal{M}}_g$ induced by the Siegel metric is*

$$d\nu_{|\hat{\mathcal{M}}_g}=\Big(\frac{i}{2}\Big)^N\det g^{\Xi}\,dw\wedge d\bar{w}\ , \tag{1.5}$$

where

$$dw := \sum_{i_N>\ldots>i_1=1}^{M} |X^\omega|{}^{\,1\ \cdots\ N}_{\,i_1\cdots i_N}\, d\tau_{i_1}\wedge\cdots\wedge d\tau_{i_N} \ , \tag{1.6}$$

and

$$g^{\Xi}_{ij} := \sum_{k,l=1}^{M} 2\chi_k^{-1}\chi_l^{-1}({\tau_2}^{-1}{\tau_2}^{-1})_{kl}B^\omega_{ik}\bar{B}^\omega_{jl} \ ,$$

with

$$B^\omega_{ij} = \sum_{k_1,\ldots,k_{N-1}=1}^{M} (-)^{j+1}|X^\omega|{}^{\,1\ldots\check{j}\ldots N}_{\,k_1\ldots k_{N-1}}\, \frac{\kappa[\omega\omega_i,\omega\omega_{k_1},\ldots,\omega\omega_{k_{N-1}}]}{\kappa[v]} \ . \tag{1.7}$$

A basic step in the investigation concerns an algebraic combinatorial formula expressing the determinant of a matrix whose entries are 2-fold products in some functions, such as $f_i(x_j)f_k(x_j)$, in terms of a summation on the permutations of products of $\det f_i(x_j)$. More precisely, let F be a commutative field and S a non-empty set. Fix a set $\{f_i\}_{i\in I_g}$, of F-valued functions on S, and choose M elements $x_i\in S$, $i\in I_M$. Then, Lemmas 3.1 and 3.3 express

$$\det{}_I\, ff(x_1,\ldots,x_{\mathrm{Card}(I)}) \ ,$$

in terms of combinatorial sums involving products of $\det f_i(x_j)$ only. We then apply such lemmas to the case in which $\{f_i\}_{i\in I_g}$ are basis of holomorphic 1-differentials and formulate the conditions that the determinants of holomorphic quadratic differentials have rank N as $M-N$ conditions involving determinants of basis of $H^0(K_C)$ only. This has several advantages. For example, whereas the determinants of a basis of $H^0(K_C^n)$, $n\geq 1$, can be directly written in terms of theta functions, this is not the case when the matrix of holomorphic n-differentials is a $k\times k$ matrix with $k>h^0(K_C^n)$. Whereas its determinant trivially vanishes, this cannot be directly expressed in terms of theta functions. The main application of Lemmas 3.1 and 3.3 is that it is instead possible first write such determinants as a combinatorial sum over products of determinants of holomorphic 1-differentials only, and then express the latter in terms of theta functions, so leading to independent relations. It is worth mentioning that, even if of increasing combinatorial complexity, Lemmas 3.1 and 3.3 admit natural extensions to the case of matrices whose entries consist of products of more than two f's.

The above construction was initiated in [5]. It also leads to the volume form on $\hat{\mathcal{M}}_g$ induced by the Siegel's metric, a result used in [6] to propose the extension to higher genus of the remarkable formula by D'Hoker and Phong [7] concerning the four point superstring amplitude.

Whereas the present construction leads to a characterization of canonical curves by determinantal relations, the known solution of the Schottky problem involves non-linear differential equations. According to the Novikov's conjecture, an indecomposable principally polarized abelian variety is the Jacobian of a genus g curve if and only if there exist vectors $U\neq 0, V, W\in\mathbb{C}^g$ such that $u(x,y,t)=2\partial_x^2\log\theta(Ux+Vy+Wt+z_0,Z)$, satisfies the Kadomtsev-Petviashvili (KP) equation

$$3u_{yy} = (4u_t + 6uu_x - u_{xxx})_x \ .$$

Relevant progresses on such a conjecture are due, among the others, to Krichever [8], Dubrovin [9] and Mulase [10]. Its proof is due to Shiota [11]. A basic step in such a proof concerned the existence of the τ-function as a global holomorphic function in the $\{t_i\}$, as clarified by Arbarello and De Concini in [12], where it was shown that only a subset of the KP hierarchy is needed. Their identification of such a subset is based on basic results by Gunning [13] and Welters [14] [15], characterizing the Jacobians by trisecants (see also [16] and [17]).

The Schottky problem is still under active investigation, see for example [18][19][20][21] for further developments. In particular, Arbarello, Krichever and Marini proved that the Jacobians can be characterized in terms of only the first of the auxiliary linear equations of the KP equation [22][23]. Very recently appeared the papers [24] and [25] that proved the conjectures by Farkas [26] and Welters [15], respectively.

In spite of such a dramatic progress, there are still open questions concerning the characterization of the Jacobian locus. In particular, the general identification of modular forms characterizing the Jacobians is still lacking. The determinantal characterization of Theorem 1.1 and the corresponding theta relations in Theorem 1.2, correspond to modular forms vanishing on the canonical curve. Such relations can be seen as addition formulas that presumably should lead to relations involving higher order theta constants with the summation on permutations on the points replaced by summation on theta characteristics.

2. Distinguished bases of $H^0(K_C^n)$ and relations among holomorphic differentials

Let C be a smooth curve of genus g. For $g > 1$, let $\{\phi_i^p\}_{i\in I_{N_p}}$, $p \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, be a basis of $H^0(K_C^p)$, where

$$N_p := h^0(K_C^p) = (2p-1)(g-1) + \delta_{p1} \ ,$$

and δ_{ij} is the Kronecker symbol. For any pair p, q, there exists a homomorphism

$$\psi^{p,q} : H^0(K_C^p) \otimes H^0(K_C^q) \to H^0(K_C^{p+q}) \ ,$$

such that

$$\psi^{p,q}(\phi^p \otimes \phi^q) = \phi^p \phi^q \ .$$

We have

$$\phi_i^p \phi_j^q = \sum_{k=1}^{N_{p+q}} B_{ij,k}^{p,q} \phi_k^{p+q} \ , \tag{2.1}$$

$i \in I_{N_p}$, $j \in I_{N_q}$, for some constant coefficients $B_{ij,k}^{p,q}$. For $g = 2$ and $g > 2$ in the non-hyperelliptic case, any holomorphic $(p+q)$-differential, $p + q \in \mathbb{Z}$, $p + q \geq 2$, can be expressed as the product of holomorphic p- and q-differentials, $p, q \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. This implies the relations

$$\phi_i^{p+q} = \sum_{j=1}^{N_p} \sum_{k=1}^{N_q} D_{i,jk}^{p,q} \phi_j^p \phi_k^q \ , \tag{2.2}$$

$i \in I_{N_{p+q}}$, and

$$\sum_{j=1}^{N_p} \sum_{k=1}^{N_q} C_{i,jk}^{p,q} \phi_j^p \phi_k^q = 0 \ , \tag{2.3}$$

$i \in I_{M_{p,q}-N_{p+q}}$, $M_{p,q} := N_p N_q$ for $p \neq q$, and $M_{p,p} = N_p(N_p+1)/2$, for some constant coefficients $C_{i,jk}^{p,q}$ and $D_{i,jk}^{p,q}$.

Proposition 2.1. *Replacing* $\phi_j^p \phi_k^q$ *in the RHS of (2.2) with (2.1) yields*

$$\sum_{k=1}^{N_p} \sum_{l=1}^{N_q} D_{i,kl}^{p,q} B_{kl,j}^{p,q} = \delta_{ij} \ , \tag{2.4}$$

$i, j \in I_{N_{p+q}}$*. Similarly, replacing* ϕ_k^{p+q} *in the RHS of (2.1) with (2.2) yields*

$$\sum_{k=1}^{N_{p+q}} B_{ij,k}^{p,q} D_{k,lm}^{p,q} = \delta_{il}\delta_{jm} + \sum_{k=1}^{M_{p,q}-N_{p+q}} A_{ij,k} C_{k,lm}^{p,q} \ , \tag{2.5}$$

$i, j, l, m \in I_{N_{p+q}}$*, for some coefficients* $A_{ij,k}$*. By the associativity relations*

$$(\phi_i^p \phi_j^q)\phi_k^r = \phi_i^p(\phi_j^q \phi_k^r) \ ,$$

we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N_{p+q}} B_{jk,i}^{p,q} B_{li,m}^{r,p+q} = \sum_{i=1}^{N_{q+r}} B_{kl,i}^{q,r} B_{ji,m}^{p,q+r} \ , \tag{2.6}$$

$j \in I_{N_p}$*,* $k \in I_{N_q}$*,* $l \in I_{N_r}$*,* $m \in I_{N_{p+q+r}}$*. Furthermore, by (2.1) and (2.3)*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N_p} \sum_{j=1}^{N_q} C_{k,ij}^{p,q} B_{ij,l}^{p,q} = 0 \ , \tag{2.7}$$

$k \in I_{M_{p,q}-N_{p+q}}$*,* $l \in I_{N_{p+q}}$*, and by (2.6) and (2.7)*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N_q} \sum_{j=1}^{N_r} \sum_{k=1}^{N_{p+q}} C_{l,ij}^{q,r} B_{mi,k}^{p,q} B_{jk,n}^{r,p+q} = 0 \ , \tag{2.8}$$

$l \in I_{M_{q,r}-N_{q+r}}$*,* $m \in I_{N_p}$*,* $n \in I_{N_{p+q+r}}$*.*

2.1. Identities induced by the isomorphism $\mathbb{C}^{M_n} \leftrightarrow \mathrm{Sym}^n\mathbb{C}^g$

Definition 2.2. For each $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, set $I_n := \{1, \ldots, n\}$ and let $\mathcal{P}_n$ denote the group of permutations of n elements.

Let V be a g-dimensional vector space and let

$$M_n := \binom{g+n-1}{n} \ ,$$

be the dimension of the n-fold symmetrized tensor product $\mathrm{Sym}^n V$. We denote by

$$\mathrm{Sym}^n V \ni \eta_1 \cdot \eta_2 \cdots \eta_n := \sum_{s \in \mathcal{P}_n} \eta_{s_1} \otimes \eta_{s_2} \otimes \ldots \otimes \eta_{s_n} \ ,$$

the symmetrized tensor product of an n-tuple $(\eta_1, \ldots, \eta_n)$ of elements of V.

It is useful to fix an isomorphism $\mathbb{C}^M \to \mathrm{Sym}^2\mathbb{C}^g$ and, more generally, an isomorphism $\mathbb{C}^{M_n} \to \mathrm{Sym}^n\mathbb{C}^g$, $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$.

Definition 2.3. Let $A : \mathbb{C}^M \to \mathrm{Sym}^2\mathbb{C}^g$, $M \equiv M_2$, be the isomorphism $A(\tilde{e}_i) := e_{\mathfrak{1}_i} \cdot e_{\mathfrak{2}_i}$, with $\{\tilde{e}_i\}_{i \in I_M}$ the canonical basis of $\mathbb{C}^M$ and

$$(\mathfrak{1}_i, \mathfrak{2}_i) := \begin{cases} (i,i) \ , & 1 \le i \le g \ , \\ (1, i-g+1) \ , & g+1 \le i \le 2g-1 \ , \\ (2, i-2g+3) \ , & 2g \le i \le 3g-3 \ , \\ \qquad\vdots & \qquad\vdots \\ (g-1, g) \ , & i = g(g+1)/2 \ , \end{cases}$$

so that $\mathfrak{1}_i\mathfrak{2}_i$ is the i-th element in the M-tuple $(11, 22, \ldots, gg, 12, \ldots, 1g, 23, \ldots)$. Similarly, let $\{\tilde{e}_i\}_{i \in I_{M_3}}$ be the canonical basis of $\mathbb{C}^{M_3}$, and fix an isomorphism $A : \mathbb{C}^{M_3} \to \mathrm{Sym}^3\mathbb{C}^g$, $M_3 := g(g+1)(g+2)/6$, with $A(\tilde{e}_i) := (e_{\mathfrak{1}_i}, e_{\mathfrak{2}_i}, e_{\mathfrak{3}_i})_S$, whose first $6g-8$ elements are

$$(\mathfrak{1}_i, \mathfrak{2}_i, \mathfrak{3}_i) := \begin{cases} (i,i,i) \ , & 1 \le i \le g \ , \\ (1,1,i-g+2) \ , & g+1 \le i \le 2g-2 \ , \\ (2,2,i-2g+4) \ , & 2g-1 \le i \le 3g-4 \ , \\ (1,2,i-3g-4) \ , & 3g-3 \le i \le 4g-4 \ , \\ (1, i-4g+6, i-4g+6) \ , & 4g-3 \le i \le 5g-6 \ , \\ (2, i-5g+8, i-5g+8) \ , & 5g-5 \le i \le 6g-8 \ . \end{cases}$$

As we will see, we do not need the explicit expression of $A(\tilde{e}_i)$ for $6g-8 < i \le M_3$. In general, one can define an isomorphism $A : \mathbb{C}^{M_n} \to \mathrm{Sym}^n\mathbb{C}^g$, with $A(\tilde{e}_i) := (e_{\mathfrak{1}_i}, \ldots, e_{\mathfrak{n}_i})$, by fixing the n-tuples $(\mathfrak{1}_i, \ldots, \mathfrak{n}_i)$, $i \in I_{M_n}$, in such a way that $\mathfrak{1}_i \le \mathfrak{2}_i \le \ldots \le \mathfrak{n}_i$.

For each vector $u := {}^t(u_1, \ldots, u_g) \in \mathbb{C}^g$ and matrix $B \in M_g(\mathbb{C})$, set

$$\underbrace{u \cdots u_i}_{n \text{ times}} := \prod_{\mathfrak{m} \in \{\mathfrak{1}, \ldots, \mathfrak{n}\}} u_{\mathfrak{m}_i} \ , \qquad (\underbrace{B \cdots B}_{n \text{ times}})_{ij} := \sum_{s \in \mathcal{P}_n} \prod_{\mathfrak{m} \in \{\mathfrak{1}, \ldots, \mathfrak{n}\}} B_{\mathfrak{m}_i s(\mathfrak{m})_j} \ ,$$

$i, j \in I_{M_n}$, where the product is the standard one in $\mathbb{C}$. In particular, let us define

$$\chi_i \equiv \chi_i^{(n)} := \prod_{k=1}^{g} \Big(\sum_{\mathfrak{m} \in \{\mathfrak{1}, \ldots, \mathfrak{n}\}} \delta_{k\mathfrak{m}_i} \Big)! = (\delta \cdots \delta)_{ii} \ ,$$

$i \in I_{M_n}$, (we will not write the superscript (n) when it is clear from the context) where δ denotes the identity matrix, so that, for example,

$$\chi_i^{(2)} = 1 + \delta_{\mathfrak{1}_i\mathfrak{2}_i} \ , \qquad \chi_i^{(3)} = (1 + \delta_{\mathfrak{1}_i\mathfrak{2}_i} + \delta_{\mathfrak{2}_i\mathfrak{3}_i})(1 + \delta_{\mathfrak{1}_i\mathfrak{3}_i}) \ .$$

Such a single indexing satisfies basic identities, repeatedly used in the following.

Lemma 2.4. *Let V be a vector space and f an arbitrary function $f : I_g^n \to V$, where $I_g^n := I_g \times \ldots \times I_g$ (n times). Then, the following identity holds*

$$\sum_{i_1,\ldots,i_n=1}^{g} f(i_1,\ldots,i_n) = \sum_{i=1}^{M_n} \chi_i^{-1} \sum_{s\in\mathcal{P}_n} f(s(\mathfrak{1})_i,\ldots,s(\mathfrak{n})_i) \ , \tag{2.9}$$

that, for f completely symmetric, reduces to

$$\sum_{i_1,\ldots,i_n=1}^{g} f(i_1,\ldots,i_n) = n! \sum_{i=1}^{M_n} \chi_i^{-1} f(\mathfrak{1}_i,\ldots,\mathfrak{n}_i) \ . \tag{2.10}$$

Proof. Use

$$\sum_{i_1,\ldots,i_n=1}^{g} f(i_1,\ldots,i_n) = \sum_{i_n\geq\ldots\geq i_1=1}^{g} \sum_{s\in\mathcal{P}_n} \frac{f(i_{s_1},\ldots,i_{s_n})}{\prod_{k=1}^{g}(\sum_{m=1}^{n}\delta_{ki_m})!} \ .$$

$\square$

Note that $u^{\otimes n} \equiv u\otimes\ldots\otimes u$ is an element of $\mathrm{Sym}^n\mathbb{C}^g \cong \mathbb{C}^{M_n}$, for each $u\in\mathbb{C}^g$. By (2.9), the following identities are easily verified

$$u^{\otimes n} \cong \sum_{i=1}^{M_n} \chi_i^{-1} u\cdots u_i \tilde{e}_i \ , \quad (Bu)^{\otimes n} \cong \sum_{i,j=1}^{M_n} \chi_i^{-1}\chi_j^{-1}(B\cdots B)_{ij} u\cdots u_j \tilde{e}_i \ ,$$

where $\mathbb{C}^{M_n} \ni \tilde{e}_i \cong e\cdots e_i \in \mathrm{Sym}^n\mathbb{C}^g$, $i\in I_{M_n}$. Furthermore,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{M_n} \chi_j^{-1}(B\cdots B)_{ij}(C\cdots C)_{jk} = ((BC)\cdots(BC))_{ik} \ , \tag{2.11}$$

where B, C are arbitrary $g\times g$ matrices. This identity yields, for any non-singular B

$$\sum_{j=1}^{M_n} \chi_j^{-1}\chi_k^{-1}(B\cdots B)_{ij}(B^{-1}\cdots B^{-1})_{jk} = (\delta\cdots\delta)_{ik}\chi_k^{-1} = \delta_{ik} \ , \tag{2.12}$$

and then

$$\det_{ij}\big((B\cdots B)_{ij}\chi_j^{-1}\big)\det_{ij}\big((B^{-1}\cdots B^{-1})_{ij}\chi_j^{-1}\big) = 1 \ . \tag{2.13}$$

Also observe that

$$\prod_{i=1}^{M_n} u\cdots u_i = \prod_{k=1}^{g} u_k^{\frac{n}{g}M_n} \ , \tag{2.14}$$

where the product and the exponentiation are the standard ones among complex numbers; in particular,

$$\prod_{i=1}^{M} uu_i = \prod_{k=1}^{g} u_k^{g+1} \ .$$

In the following we will denote the minors of $(B\cdots B)$ by

$$|B\cdots B|_{j_1\ldots j_m}^{i_1\ldots i_m} := \det_{\substack{i\in i_1,\ldots,i_m\\ j\in j_1,\ldots,j_m}} (B\cdots B)_{ij} \ ,$$

$i_1,\ldots,i_m,j_1,\ldots,j_m \in I_{M_n}$, with $m\in I_{M_n}$.

2.2. A distinguished basis of $H^0(K_C^2)$

Let C be a canonical curve of genus g and let C_d, $d > 0$, be the set of effective divisors of degree d. Set $\eta_i := \phi_i^1$, $i \in I_g$, and fix the divisor $c := x_1 + \ldots + x_{g-1}$ in such a way that the matrix $[\eta_i(x_j)]_{\substack{i\in I_g \\ j\in I_{g-1}}}$ be of maximal rank. The ratio

$$\sigma_c(p,q) := \frac{\det \eta(p, x_1, \ldots, x_{g-1})}{\det \eta(q, x_1, \ldots, x_{g-1})} \ ,$$

is a meromorphic function on C_{g-1} and a meromorphic section of the bundle

$$\mathcal{L} := \pi_1^* K_C \otimes \pi_2^* K_C^{-1} \ ,$$

on $C \times C$, where π_1, π_2 are the projections of $C \times C$ onto its first and second component, respectively. Note that $\delta^*(\mathcal{L})$, where $\delta : C \to C \times C$ is the diagonal embedding $\delta(p) := (p,p)$, $p \in C$, is the trivial line bundle on C. Furthermore, $\delta^*\sigma_c$ has neither zeros nor poles, and $\sigma_c(p,p)/\sigma_{c'}(p,p) = 1$, $c, c' \in C_{g-1}$. Hence, there exists an isomorphism $H^0(\delta^*(\mathcal{L})) \to \mathbb{C}$ such that $\sigma_c(p,p) \to 1$, for all $c \in C_{g-1}$ for which σ_c is well-defined.

Proposition 2.5. *Fix $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and let $p_1, \ldots, p_{N_n}$ be a set of points of C such that*

$$\det \phi^n(p_1, \ldots, p_{N_n}) \neq 0 \ ,$$

with $\{\phi_i^n\}_{i\in I_{N_n}}$ an arbitrary basis of $H^0(K_C^n)$. Then

$$\gamma_i^n(z) := \frac{\det \phi^n(p_1, \ldots, p_{i-1}, z, p_{i+1}, \ldots, p_{N_n})}{\det \phi^n(p_1, \ldots, p_{N_n})} \ , \tag{2.15}$$

$i \in I_{N_n}$, for all $z \in C$, is a basis of $H^0(K_C^n)$ which is independent of the choice of the basis $\{\phi_i^n\}_{i\in I_{N_n}}$ and, up to normalization, of the local coordinates on C.

Proof. Since the matrix $[\phi^n]_{ij} := \phi_i^n(p_j)$ is non-singular, it follows that

$$\gamma_i^n = \sum_{j=1}^{N_n} [\phi^n]_{ij}^{-1} \phi_j^n \ , \tag{2.16}$$

$i \in I_{N_n}$, is a basis of $H^0(K_C^n)$. □

Observe that

$$\det \gamma_i^n(p_1, \ldots, p_{j-1}, z, p_{j+1}, \ldots, p_{N_n}) = \gamma_j^n(z) \ , \tag{2.17}$$

for all $z \in C$, and

$$\gamma_i^n(p_j) = \delta_{ij} \ , \tag{2.18}$$

$i, j \in I_{N_n}$. Furthermore,

$$\det \gamma_i^n(z_j) = \frac{\det \phi_i^n(z_j)}{\det \phi_i^n(p_j)} \ , \tag{2.19}$$

for all $z_1, \ldots, z_g \in C$. For $n = 1$, a choice of $p_1, \ldots, p_g \in C$ such that $\det \eta_i(p_j) \neq 0$ determines a basis of $H^0(K_C)$

$$\sigma_i(z) := \gamma_i^1(z) \ , \tag{2.20}$$

$i \in I_g$.

Each basis $\{\eta_i\}_{i\in I_g}$ of $H^0(K_C)$ naturally defines a basis in $\mathrm{Sym}^2(H^0(K_C))$ by $\eta \cdot \eta_i := \eta_{1_i} \cdot \eta_{2_i}$, $i \in I_M$. Set

$$v_i := \psi(\sigma \cdot \sigma_i) = \sigma_{1_i}\sigma_{2_i} \ , \tag{2.21}$$

$i \in I_M$, and note that

$$v_i(p_j) = \begin{cases} \delta_{ij} \ , & i \in I_g \ , \\ 0 \ , & g+1 \le i \le M \ , \end{cases} \tag{2.22}$$

$j \in I_g$. By Max Noether's Theorem, if C is a Riemann surface of genus two or non-hyperelliptic with $g \geq 3$, then all the possible products of two holomorphic 1-differentials in $H^0(K_C)$ span the whole $H^0(K_C^2)$. By dimensional reasons, it follows that for $g = 2$ and $g = 3$ in the non-hyperelliptic case, the set $\{v_i\}_{i\in I_N}$ is a basis of $H^0(K_C^2)$ if and only if $\{\sigma_i\}_{i\in I_g}$ is a basis of $H^0(K_C)$. On the other hand, for $g \geq 3$ in the hyperelliptic case, with $g \geq 3$, there exist holomorphic quadratic differentials which cannot be expressed as linear combinations of products of elements of $H^0(K_C)$, so that $v_1, \ldots, v_N$ are not linearly independent. The other possibilities are considered in the following proposition.

Proposition 2.6. *Fix the points $p_1, \ldots, p_g \in C$, with C non-hyperelliptic of genus $g \geq 4$. If the following conditions are satisfied*

i. $\det \eta_i(p_j) \neq 0$, *with $\{\eta_i\}_{i\in I_g}$ an arbitrary basis of $H^0(K_C)$;*

ii. $b := \sum_{i=3}^{g} p_i$ *is the greatest common divisor of (σ_1) and (σ_2), with $\{\sigma_i\}_{i\in I_g}$ defined in (2.20),*

then $\{v_i\}_{i\in I_N}$ is a basis of $H^0(K_C^2)$.

Proof. Let us first prove that σ_i is the unique 1-differential, up to normalization, vanishing at $c_i := (\sigma_i) - b$, $i = 1, 2$. Any 1-differential $\sigma_i' \in H^0(K_C)$ vanishing at c_i corresponds to an element σ_i'/σ_i of $H^0(\mathcal{O}(b))$, the space of meromorphic functions f on C such that $(f) + b$ is an effective divisor. Suppose that there exists a σ_i' such that σ_i'/σ_i is not a constant, so that $h^0(\mathcal{O}(b)) \geq 2$. By the Riemann-Roch Theorem

$$h^0(K_C \otimes \mathcal{O}(-b)) = h^0(\mathcal{O}(b)) - \deg b - 1 + g \geq 3 \ ,$$

there exist at least 3 linearly independent 1-differentials vanishing at the support of b and, in particular, there exists a linear combination of such differentials vanishing at $p_1, \ldots, p_g$. This implies that $\det \eta_i(p_j) \neq 0$, with $\{\eta_i\}_{i\in I_g}$ an arbitrary basis of $H^0(K_C)$, contradicting the hypotheses. Fix $\zeta_i, \zeta_{1i}, \zeta_{2i} \in \mathbb{C}$ in such a way that

$$\sum_{i=3}^{g} \zeta_i \sigma_i^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{g} \zeta_{2i}\sigma_1\sigma_i + \sum_{i=2}^{g} \zeta_{1i}\sigma_2\sigma_i = 0 \ .$$

Evaluating this relation at the point p_j, $3 \le j \le g$ yields $\zeta_j = 0$. Set

$$t_1 := -\sum_{j=2}^{g} \zeta_{1j}\sigma_j \ , \quad t_2 := \sum_{j=1}^{g} \zeta_{2j}\sigma_j \ , \tag{2.23}$$

so that $\sigma_1 t_2 = \sigma_2 t_1$. Since b, c_1 and c_2 consist of pairwise distinct points, t_i vanishes at c_i, $i = 1, 2$ and then, by the previous remarks, $t_1/\sigma_1 = t_2/\sigma_2 = \zeta \in \mathbb{C}$. By (2.23)

$$\zeta\sigma_1 + \sum_{j=2}^{g} \zeta_{1j}\sigma_j = 0 \ , \quad \zeta\sigma_2 - \sum_{k=1}^{g} \zeta_{2k}\sigma_k = 0 \ ,$$

and, by linear independence of $\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_g$, it follows that $\zeta = \zeta_{1j} = \zeta_{2k} = 0$, $2 \le j \le g$, $k \in I_g$. $\square$

The basis $\{v_i\}_{i\in I_N}$ is a refinement of the Petri basis for $H^0(K_C^2)$ [1] (see also [27]). It can be proved that on a non-hyperelliptic curve, there always exists a set of points $\{p_1, \ldots, p_g\}$ satisfying the hypotheses of proposition 2.6.

2.3. Relations among holomorphic quadratic differentials

Denote by $\tilde{\phi}^n : H^0(K_C^n) \to \mathbb{C}^{N_n}$ the isomorphism $\tilde{\phi}^n(\phi_i^n) = e_i$, with $\{e_i\}_{i\in I_{N_n}}$ the canonical basis of $\mathbb{C}^{N_n}$. The isomorphism $\tilde{\eta}$ induces an isomorphism $(\tilde{\eta}\cdot\tilde{\eta}) : \mathrm{Sym}^2(H^0(K_C)) \to \mathrm{Sym}^2\mathbb{C}^g$. The natural map $\psi : \mathrm{Sym}^2(H^0(K_C)) \to H^0(K_C^2)$ is an epimorphism if C is canonical. In the following we derive the matrix form of the map $\tilde{v} \circ \psi \circ (\tilde{\sigma}\cdot\tilde{\sigma})^{-1}$, with respect to the basis $\{\sigma_i\}_{i\in I_g}$ constructed in the previous subsection. This will lead to the explicit expression of $\ker\psi$.

For each set $\{\phi_i^n\}_{i\in I_{N_n}} \subset H^0(K_C^n)$, consider $W[\phi^n](p_1, \ldots, p_{N_n}) := \det \phi_i^n(p_j)$, and the Wronskian $W[\phi^n](p) := \det \partial_p^{j-1}\phi_i^n(p)$. If $W[\phi^n](p_1, \ldots, p_{N_n})$ does not vanish identically, then, for each $\{\phi_i^{n'}\}_{i\in I_{N_n}} \subset H^0(K_C^n)$, we have the constant ratio

$$\mathcal{R}_{\phi^n}[\phi^{n'}] := \frac{W[\phi^{n'}](p_1, \ldots, p_{N_n})}{W[\phi^n](p_1, \ldots, p_{N_n})} = \frac{W[\phi^{n'}](p)}{W[\phi^n](p)} \ . \tag{2.24}$$

Set

$$\tilde{\psi}_{ij} := \mathcal{R}_v[v_1, \ldots, v_{i-1}, v_j, v_{i+1}, \ldots, v_N] \ . \tag{2.25}$$

$i \in I_N$, $j \in I_M$.

Lemma 2.7. *$v_1, \ldots, v_M$ satisfy the following $(g-2)(g-3)/2$ linearly independent relations*

$$v_i = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \tilde{\psi}_{ji} v_j = \sum_{j=g+1}^{N} \tilde{\psi}_{ji} v_j \ , \tag{2.26}$$

$i = N+1, \ldots, M$.

Proof. The first equality trivially follows by the Cramer rule. The identities (2.22) imply $\tilde{\psi}_{ji} = 0$ for $j \in I_g$ and $i = N+1, \ldots, M$, and the lemma follows. $\square$

Eq.(2.26) implies that the diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathrm{Sym}^2(H^0(K_C^2)) \arrow[r, "\psi"] \arrow[d, "(\tilde{\sigma}\cdot\tilde{\sigma})"'] & H^0(K_C^2) \arrow[d, "\tilde{v}"] \\
\mathbb{C}^M \arrow[r, "\tilde{\psi}"] & \mathbb{C}^N
\end{tikzcd}$$

where $\tilde{\psi} : \mathbb{C}^M \to \mathbb{C}^N$ is the homomorphism with matrix elements $\tilde{\psi}_{ij}$ and $\mathrm{Sym}^2\mathbb{C}^g$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{C}^M$ through A defined in Definition 2.3, commutes.

Let $\iota : \mathbb{C}^N \to \mathbb{C}^M$ be the injection $\iota(e_i) = \tilde{e}_i$, $i \in I_N$. The matrix elements of the map $\iota \circ \tilde{\psi} : \mathbb{C}^M \to \mathbb{C}^M$ are

$$(\iota \circ \tilde{\psi})_{ij} = \begin{cases} \tilde{\psi}_{ij} \ , & 1 \leq i \leq N \ , \\ 0 \ , & N+1 \leq i \leq M \ , \end{cases}$$

$j \in I_M$. Noting that $(\iota \circ \tilde{\psi})_{ij} = \delta_{ij}$, $\forall\, i, j \in I_N$, we obtain

$$\sum_{i=1}^{M} (\iota \circ \tilde{\psi})_{ji} (\iota \circ \tilde{\psi})_{ik} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} (\iota \circ \tilde{\psi})_{ji} \tilde{\psi}_{ik} = (\iota \circ \tilde{\psi})_{jk} \ ,$$

$j, k \in I_M$. Hence, $\iota \circ \tilde{\psi}$ is a projection of rank N and, since ι is an injection,

$$\ker \tilde{\psi} = \ker \iota \circ \tilde{\psi} = (\mathrm{id} - \iota \circ \tilde{\psi})(\mathbb{C}^M) \ . \tag{2.27}$$

Lemma 2.8. *The set* $\{\tilde{u}_{N+1}, \ldots, \tilde{u}_M\}$, $\tilde{u}_i := \tilde{e}_i - \sum_{j=1}^{N} \tilde{e}_j \tilde{\psi}_{ji}$, $N+1 \leq i \leq M$, *is a basis of* $\ker \tilde{\psi}$.

Proof. Since $(\mathrm{id} - \iota \circ \tilde{\psi})(\tilde{e}_i) = 0$, $i \in I_N$, by (2.27), the $M - N$ vectors $\tilde{u}_i = (\mathrm{id} - \iota \circ \tilde{\psi})(\tilde{e}_i)$, $N < i \leq M$ are a set of generators for $\ker \psi$ and, since $\dim \ker \psi = M - N$, the lemma follows. $\square$

Set $\eta\eta_i := \psi(\eta \cdot \eta_i)$, $i \in I_g$, and let X^η be the automorphism on $\mathbb{C}^M$ in the commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd} \mathrm{Sym}^2(H^0(K_C^2)) \arrow[r, "\mathrm{id}"] \arrow[d, "(\tilde{\sigma} \cdot \tilde{\sigma})"'] & \mathrm{Sym}^2(H^0(K_C^2)) \arrow[d, "(\tilde{\eta} \cdot \tilde{\eta})"] \\ \mathbb{C}^M \arrow[r, "X^\eta"] & \mathbb{C}^M \end{tikzcd}$$

whose matrix elements are

$$X^\eta_{ji} = \chi_j^{-1}([\eta]^{-1}[\eta]^{-1})_{ij} = \frac{[\eta]^{-1}_{1_i 1_j} [\eta]^{-1}_{2_i 2_j} + [\eta]^{-1}_{1_i 2_j} [\eta]^{-1}_{2_i 1_j}}{1 + \delta_{1_j 2_j}} \ , \tag{2.28}$$

$i, j \in I_M$, so that

$$v_i = \sum_{j=1}^{M} X^\eta_{ji} \, \eta\eta_j \ , \tag{2.29}$$

$i \in I_M$. Since $\eta\eta_i$, $i \in I_M$, are linearly dependent, the matrix X^η_{ij} is not univocally determined by Eq.(2.29). More precisely, a homomorphism $X^{\eta'} \in \mathrm{End}(\mathbb{C}^M)$ satisfies Eq.(2.29) if and only if the diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd} \mathbb{C}^M \arrow[r, "\tilde{\psi}"] \arrow[d, "X^{\eta'}"'] & \mathbb{C}^N \arrow[d, "\mathrm{id}"] \\ \mathbb{C}^M \arrow[r, "B^\eta"] & \mathbb{C}^N \end{tikzcd}$$

where $B^\eta := \tilde\psi \circ (X^\eta)^{-1}$, commutes or, equivalently, if and only if

$$(X^{\eta'} - X^\eta)(\mathbb{C}^M) \subseteq X^\eta(\ker \tilde\psi) \ . \tag{2.30}$$

Next theorem provides an explicit expression for such a homomorphisms. Consider the following determinants of the d-dimensional submatrices of X^η

$$|X^\eta|^{\,j_1\dots j_d}_{\,i_1\dots i_d} := \det \begin{pmatrix} X^\eta_{i_1 j_1} & \dots & X^\eta_{i_1 j_d} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ X^\eta_{i_d j_1} & \dots & X^\eta_{i_d j_d} \end{pmatrix} \ ,$$

$i_1, \dots, i_d, j_1, \dots, j_d \in I_M$, $d \in I_M$.

Theorem 2.9.

$$\sum_{j=1}^M C^\eta_{ij} \eta\eta_j = 0 \ , \tag{2.31}$$

$N+1 \le i \le M$, where

$$C^\eta_{ij} := \sum_{k_1,\dots,k_N=1}^M |X^\eta|^{\,1\ \dots\ N i}_{\,k_1\dots k_N j} \ \mathcal{R}_v[\eta\eta_{k_1}, \dots, \eta\eta_{k_N}] \ , \tag{2.32}$$

are $M-N$ independent linear relations among quadratic differentials. Furthermore, for all $p \in C$

$$W[v](p) = \sum_{i_1,\dots,i_N=1}^M |X^\eta|^{\,1\ \dots\ N}_{\,i_1\dots i_N} \ W[\eta\eta_{k_1}, \dots, \eta\eta_{k_N}](p) \ . \tag{2.33}$$

Proof. By (2.26) and (2.29)

$$\sum_{j=1}^M (X^\eta_{ji} - \sum_{k=1}^N \tilde\psi_{ki} X^\eta_{jk}) \eta\eta_j = 0 \ ,$$

and by (2.25)

$$\sum_{j=1}^M \Bigg[\sum_{k=1}^N (-)^k \mathcal{R}_v[v_i, v_1, \dots, \check v_k, \dots, v_N] X^\eta_{jk} + X^\eta_{ji} \Bigg] \eta\eta_j = 0 \ .$$

By (2.29)

$$\mathcal{R}_v[v_{i_1}, \dots, v_{i_N}] = \sum_{k_1,\dots,k_N=1}^M |X^\eta|^{\,i_1\dots i_N}_{\,k_1\dots k_N} \mathcal{R}_v[\eta\eta_{k_1}, \dots, \eta\eta_{k_N}] \ ,$$

and we get (2.31) with

$$C^\eta_{ij} = \sum_{k_1,\dots,k_N=1}^M \Bigg[\sum_{l=1}^N (-)^l X^\eta_{jl} \ |X^\eta|^{\,i\,1\dots\check l\dots N}_{\,k_1\dots\dots k_N} + X^\eta_{ji} \ |X^\eta|^{\,1\ \dots\ N}_{\,k_1\dots k_N} \Bigg] \mathcal{R}_v[\eta\eta_{k_1}, \dots, \eta\eta_{k_N}] \ ,$$

which is equivalent to (2.32) by the identity

$$\sum_{l=1}^N (-)^l X^\eta_{jl} \ |X^\eta|^{\,i\,1\dots\check l\dots N}_{\,k_1\dots\dots k_N} + X^\eta_{ji} \ |X^\eta|^{\,1\ \dots\ N}_{\,k_1\dots k_N} = |X^\eta|^{\,i1\ \dots\ N}_{\,j k_1\dots k_N} \ .$$

Eq.(2.33) follows by (2.29). $\square$

The homomorphisms $(X^{\eta'} - X^{\eta}) \in \mathrm{End}(\mathbb{C}^M)$, satisfying (2.30), are the elements of a $M(M-N)$ dimensional vector space, spanned by

$$(X^{\eta'} - X^{\eta})_{ij} = \sum_{k=N+1}^{M} \Lambda_{jk} C^{\eta}_{ki} \ ,$$

$i, j \in I_M$, with Λ_{jk} an arbitrary $M \times (M-N)$ matrix. An obvious generalization of (2.26) yields

$$\eta\eta_i = \sum_{j=1}^{N} v_j B^{\eta}_{ji} \ , \tag{2.34}$$

$i \in I_M$, implying that $B^{\eta}_{ij} = \mathcal{R}_v[v_1, \ldots, v_{j-1}, \eta\eta_i, v_{j+1}, \ldots, v_N]$, are the matrix elements of the homomorphism $B^{\eta} = \tilde{\psi} \circ (X^{\eta})^{-1}$. Such coefficients can be expanded as

$$B^{\eta}_{ij} = \sum_{k_1, \ldots, k_{N-1}=1}^{M} (-)^{j+1} |X^{\eta}|^{\,1 \ldots \check{j} \ldots N}_{\,k_1 \ldots k_{N-1}} \ \mathcal{R}_v[\eta\eta_i, \eta\eta_{k_1}, \ldots, \eta\eta_{k_{N-1}}] \ . \tag{2.35}$$

2.4. A distinguished basis of $H^0(K_C^3)$

Consider the holomorphic 3-differentials (with the notation defined in sec. 2.1)

$$\varphi_i = \sigma\sigma\sigma_i := \sigma_{1_i}\sigma_{2_i}\sigma_{3_i} \ , \tag{2.36}$$

$i \in I_{M_3}$, with $\{\sigma_i\}_{i \in I_g}$ a basis of $H^0(K_C)$. By the Max Noether's Theorem and dimensional reasons, it follows that the first $N_3 := 5g - 5$ of such differentials are a basis of $H^0(K_C^3)$ for $g = 3$ in the non-hyperelliptic case, whereas they are not linearly independent for $g \geq 2$ in the hyperelliptic case. The other possibilities are considered in the following proposition.

Proposition 2.10. *Fix the points $p_1, \ldots, p_g \in C$, with C non-hyperelliptic of genus $g \geq 4$. If the following conditions are satisfied for some fixed $i \in I_g \setminus \{1, 2\}$:*

i. $\det \eta_j(p_k) \neq 0$*, with $\{\eta_j\}_{j \in I_g}$ an arbitrary basis of $H^0(K_C)$;*

ii. $b := \sum_{j=3}^{g} p_j$ *is the greatest common divisor of (σ_1) and (σ_2), with $\{\sigma_j\}_{j \in I_g}$ defined in (2.20);*

iii. p_k *is a single zero for σ_1, for all $k \neq i$, $3 \leq k \leq g$;*

then the set $\{\varphi_j\}_{j \in I_{N_3 - 1}} \cup \{\varphi_{i+5g-8}\}$ is a basis of $H^0(K_C^3)$.

Proof. Assume that *i*), *ii*) and *iii*) hold for a fixed i, $3 \leq i \leq g$; we have to prove that the equation

$$\sum_{j=3}^{g} (\zeta_j \sigma_j^3 + \zeta_{1j}\sigma_1\sigma_j^2 + \zeta_{12j}\sigma_1\sigma_2\sigma_j) + \sigma_1^2\mu + \sigma_2^2\nu + \zeta_{2i}\sigma_2\sigma_i^2 = 0 \ ,$$

is satisfied if and only if $\zeta_j, \zeta_{1j}, \zeta_{2i}, \zeta_{12j} \in \mathbb{C}$, $3 \leq j \leq g$, and $\mu, \nu \in H^0(K_C)$ all vanish identically (no non-trivial solution). Evaluating such an equation at $p_j \in C$, $3 \leq j \leq g$, gives $\zeta_j = 0$. Furthermore, note that, by condition *iii*), for each $j \neq i$, $3 \leq j \leq g$, $\sigma_1\sigma_j^2$ is the unique 3-differential with a single zero in p_j, so that $\zeta_{1j} = 0$. We are left with

$$\zeta_{1i}\sigma_1\sigma_i^2 + \zeta_{2i}\sigma_2\sigma_i^2 + \sigma_1^2\mu + \sigma_2^2\nu + \sum_{j=3}^{g} \zeta_{12j}\sigma_1\sigma_2\sigma_j = 0 \ . \tag{2.37}$$

By Riemann-Roch Theorem, for each k, $3 \leq k \leq g$, $h^0(K_C \otimes \mathcal{O}(-b - p_k)) \geq 1$; the condition *ii*) implies that $h^0(K_C \otimes \mathcal{O}(-b - p_k)) \leq 1$, so that, in particular, there exists a unique (up to a constant) non-vanishing β in $H^0(K_C \otimes \mathcal{O}(-b - p_i))$. Furthermore,

$$H^0(K_C \otimes \mathcal{O}(-b)) \neq \bigcup_{k=3}^{g} H^0(K_C \otimes \mathcal{O}(-b - p_k)) \ ,$$

because the LHS is a 2-dimensional space and the RHS is a finite union of 1-dimensional subspaces; then, there exists $\alpha \in H^0(K_C \otimes \mathcal{O}(-b))$ such that $p_3, \ldots, p_g$ are single zeros for α. Note that α and β span $H^0(K_C \otimes \mathcal{O}(-b))$ and α^2, β^2 and $\alpha\beta$ span $H^0(K_C^2 \otimes \mathcal{O}(-2b))$. Hence, the existence of non-trivial $\zeta_{1i}, \zeta_{2i}, \zeta_{12j}, \nu, \mu$ satisfying Eq.(2.37) is equivalent to the existence of non-trivial $\nu', \mu' \in H^0(K_C)$ and $\zeta_\alpha, \zeta_\beta, \zeta_{\alpha\beta j} \in \mathbb{C}$ satisfying

$$\zeta_\alpha\alpha\sigma_i^2 + \zeta_\beta\beta\sigma_i^2 + \alpha^2\mu' + \beta^2\nu' + \sum_{j=3}^{g} \zeta_{\alpha\beta j}\alpha\beta\sigma_j = 0 \ .$$

Note that $\alpha\sigma_i^2$ is the unique 3-differential with a single zero in p_i, so that $\zeta_\alpha = 0$. Condition *ii*) implies that b is the greatest common divisor of (α) and (β). Then $\alpha \neq 0$ on the support of c_β, where $c_\beta := (\beta) - b - p_i$. Hence, $\mu' \in H^0(K_C \otimes \mathcal{O}(-c_\beta))$, which, by Riemann-Roch Theorem, is a 1-dimensional space, so that $\mu' = \zeta'_\mu\beta$, for some $\zeta'_\mu \in \mathbb{C}$. Since, by construction, $\beta \neq 0$, we have

$$\zeta_\beta\sigma_i^2 + \zeta'_\mu\alpha^2 + \beta\nu' + \sum_{j=3}^{g} \zeta_{\alpha\beta j}\alpha\sigma_j = 0 \ .$$

By evaluating such an equation at p_i gives $\zeta_\beta = 0$. Furthermore, since $\beta \neq 0$ on the support of c_α, where $c_\alpha := (\alpha) - b$, it follows that $\nu' = \zeta'_\nu\alpha$, for some $\zeta'_\nu \in \mathbb{C}$. Since $\alpha \neq 0$

$$\zeta'_\mu\alpha + \zeta'_\nu\beta + \sum_{j=3}^{g} \zeta_{\alpha\beta j}\sigma_j = 0 \ ,$$

which implies that $\zeta'_\mu = \zeta'_\nu = \zeta_{\alpha\beta j} = 0$, for all $3 \leq j \leq g$. □

2.5. Relations among holomorphic cubic differentials

The choice of a basis $\{\eta_i\}_{i \in I_g}$ of $H^0(K_C)$ determines an embedding of the curve C in $\mathbb{P}_{g-1}$ by $p \mapsto (\eta_1(p) : \ldots : \eta_g(p))$. Each holomorphic n-differential corresponds to a homogeneous n-degree polynomial in $\mathbb{P}_{g-1}$ by

$$\phi^n := \sum_{i_1,\ldots,i_n} B_{i_1,\ldots,i_n}\eta_{i_1}\cdots\eta_{i_n} \mapsto \sum_{i_1,\ldots,i_n} B_{i_1,\ldots,i_n}X_{i_1}\cdots X_{i_n} \ ,$$

where $X_1, \ldots, X_g$ are homogeneous coordinates on $\mathbb{P}_{g-1}$. A basis of $H^0(K_C^n)$ corresponds to a basis of the homogeneous polynomials of degree n in $\mathbb{P}_{g-1}$ that are not zero when restricted to C. The curve C is identified with the ideal of all the polynomials in $\mathbb{P}_{g-1}$ vanishing at C. Enriques-Babbage and Petri's Theorems state that, with few exceptions, such an ideal is generated by the quadrics

$$\sum_{j=1}^{M} C^{\eta}_{ij} XX_j = 0 \ ,$$

$N+1 \leq i \leq M$, where $XX_j := X_{1_j} X_{2_j}$. Canonical curves that are not cut out by such quadrics are trigonal or isomorphic to smooth plane quintic. In these cases, Petri's Theorem assures that the ideal is generated by the quadrics above together with a suitable set of cubics. Such cubics correspond to linear relations among holomorphic 3-differentials, and a generalization of the previous construction is necessary in order to explicitly determine such relations.

Let us consider the case of holomorphic cubic differentials. Fix $3 \leq i \leq g$ and let $\{\varphi_j\}_{j \in I_{N_3-1}} \cup \{\varphi_{i+5g-8}\}$ be the corresponding basis of $H^0(K_C^3)$. The kernel of the canonical surjection $\mathrm{Sym}^3 H^0(K_C) \to H^0(K_C^3)$ has dimension $(g-3)(g^2+6g-10)/6$, and each element corresponds to a linear combination of the following relations

$$\sigma_j \sigma_k \sigma_l = \sum_{m \in I_{N_3-1}} B_{jkl,m} \varphi_m + B_{jkl,i+5g-8} \sigma_2 \sigma_i^2 \ , \tag{2.38}$$

$3 \leq j,k,l \leq g$, $j \neq k$, and

$$\sigma_2 \sigma_j^2 = \sum_{m \in I_{N_3-1}} B_{2jj,m} \varphi_m + B_{2jj,i+5g-8} \sigma_2 \sigma_i^2 \ , \tag{2.39}$$

$3 \leq j \leq g$, $j \neq i$, where $B_{jkl,m}, B_{2jj,m} \in \mathbb{C}$, are suitable coefficients. On the other hand, a trivial computation shows that the relations (2.38) are generated by (2.39) and by the relations among holomorphic quadratic differentials,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{M} C^{\sigma}_{kj} \sigma\sigma_j = 0 \ , \tag{2.40}$$

$k = N+1, \ldots, M$. Therefore, relations among holomorphic 3-differentials, provide at most $g-3$ independent conditions on products of elements of $H^0(K_C)$ which do not descend from relations among holomorphic quadratic differentials.

The relations (2.39) can be restated in terms of an arbitrary basis $\{\eta_j\}_{j \in I_g}$ of $H^0(K_C)$. Let Y^η be the automorphism of $\mathbb{C}^{M_3}$, determined by

$$Y^{\eta}_{kj} := \chi_k^{-1} ([\eta]^{-1} [\eta]^{-1} [\eta]^{-1})_{jk} \ , \tag{2.41}$$

$j,k \in I_{M_3}$, so that

$$\varphi_j = \sum_{k=1}^{M_3} Y^{\eta}_{kj} \eta\eta\eta_k \ ,$$

$j \in I_{M_3}$. Consider the following determinants of d-dimensional submatrices of Y^η

$$|Y^\eta|^{\,j_1 \ldots j_d}_{\,i_1 \ldots i_d} := \det \begin{pmatrix} Y^{\eta}_{i_1 j_1} & \ldots & Y^{\eta}_{i_1 j_d} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ Y^{\eta}_{i_d j_1} & \ldots & Y^{\eta}_{i_d j_d} \end{pmatrix} \ ,$$

$i_1, \ldots, i_d, j_1, \ldots, j_d \in I_{M_3}$, $d \in I_{M_3}$.

Proposition 2.11.

$$\sum_{j=1}^{M_3} D^{\eta}_{kj} \eta\eta\eta_j = 0 \ , \tag{2.42}$$

$N_3 \le k \le N_3 + g - 3$, $k \neq i$ where

$$D^{\eta}_{kj} := \sum_{k_1, \ldots, k_{N_3}=1}^{M_3} |Y^{\eta}|^{\,1 \ldots (N_3-1)\; i\; k}_{\,k_1 \;\ldots\; k_{N_3}\; j} \; \mathcal{R}_{\varphi}[\eta\eta\eta_{k_1}, \ldots, \eta\eta\eta_{k_{N_3}}] \ , \tag{2.43}$$

$j \in I_{M_3}$, are $g - 3$ independent linear relations among holomorphic 3-differentials.

Proof. Without loss of generality we can assume $i = N_3$; such an assumption can always be satisfied after a re-ordering of the points $p_3, \ldots, p_g$. Fix N_3+1 arbitrary points $x_1, \ldots, x_{N_3}, x_{N_3+1} \equiv z \in C$ and consider the singular matrix $[\varphi_l(x_m)]_{\substack{l \in I \\ m \in I_{N_3+1}}}$ with $I := I_{N_3} \cup \{k\}$, with $N_3 < k \le N_3 + g - 3$. By expressing the determinant with respect to the column $(\varphi_l(z))_{l \in I}$, the identity $\det \varphi_l(x_m) = 0$, $l \in I$, $m \in I_{N_3+1}$, yields

$$\sum_{m=1}^{M_3} \Big[\sum_{l=1}^{N_3} (-)^{l+1} \mathcal{R}_{\varphi}[\varphi_1, \ldots, \check{\varphi}_l, \ldots, \varphi_{N_3}, \varphi_k] Y^{\eta}_{ml} - Y^{\eta}_{mk} \Big] \eta\eta\eta_m = 0 \ .$$

The proposition follows by combinatorial identities analogous to the proof of Theorem 2.9. □

Whereas for $g = 4$ the relations (2.42) are independent of the relation among holomorphic quadratic differentials, for $g \ge 5$, (2.42) are generated by (2.40) in all but some particular curves. Set $\tilde{\psi}_{1_i 2_i, 1_j 2_j} := \tilde{\psi}_{ij}$ and $C^{\sigma}_{1_i 2_i, 1_j 2_j} := C^{\sigma}_{ij}$, $N + 1 \le i \le M$, $j \in I_M$. Consider the 3-differentials $\sigma_i \sigma_j \sigma_k$ with $3 \le i < j < k \le g$ ($g \ge 5$). By Eq.(2.40) and by $C^{\sigma}_{ij} = \tilde{\psi}_{ij} - \delta_{ij}$, $N + 1 \le i \le M$, $j \in I_M$,

$$\sigma_i \sigma_j \sigma_k = \sum_{m=1}^{2} \sum_{n=3}^{g} \tilde{\psi}_{ij,mn} \sigma_m \sigma_n \sigma_k + \tilde{\psi}_{ij,12} \sigma_1 \sigma_2 \sigma_j \ ,$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{m,p=1}^{2} \sum_{q=3}^{g} \Big(\sum_{\substack{n=3 \\ n \neq j}}^{g} \tilde{\psi}_{ik,mn} \tilde{\psi}_{nj,pq} \Big) \sigma_m \sigma_p \sigma_q + \tilde{\psi}_{ik,12} \sigma_1 \sigma_2 \sigma_k + \sum_{m=1}^{2} \tilde{\psi}_{ik,mj} \sigma_m \sigma_j^2 \\ &= \sum_{m,p=1}^{2} \sum_{q=3}^{g} \Big(\sum_{\substack{n=3 \\ n \neq i}}^{g} \tilde{\psi}_{jk,mn} \tilde{\psi}_{ni,pq} \Big) \sigma_m \sigma_p \sigma_q + \tilde{\psi}_{jk,12} \sigma_1 \sigma_2 \sigma_k + \sum_{m=1}^{2} \tilde{\psi}_{jk,mi} \sigma_m \sigma_i^2 \ . \end{aligned}$$

The above equation yields

$$\begin{aligned} C^{\sigma}_{ik,2j} \sigma_2 \sigma_j^2 = &\sum_{m,p=1}^{2} \sum_{q=3}^{g} \Big(\sum_{\substack{n=3 \\ n \neq i}}^{g} C^{\sigma}_{jk,mn} C^{\sigma}_{ni,pq} - \sum_{\substack{n=3 \\ n \neq j}}^{g} C^{\sigma}_{ik,mn} C^{\sigma}_{nj,pq} \Big) \sigma_m \sigma_p \sigma_q \\ &+ C^{\sigma}_{jk,12} \sigma_1 \sigma_2 \sigma_k - C^{\sigma}_{ik,12} \sigma_1 \sigma_2 \sigma_k + C^{\sigma}_{jk,1i} \sigma_1 \sigma_i^2 - C^{\sigma}_{ik,1j} \sigma_1 \sigma_j^2 + C^{\sigma}_{jk,2i} \sigma_2 \sigma_i^2 \ . \end{aligned}$$

If $C^{\sigma}_{ik,2j} \neq 0$ for some k, the above identity shows that the relation (2.39) is generated by Eqs.(2.40). On the other hand, it can be proved [27] that if $C^{\sigma}_{ik,2j} = 0$ for all $3 \le k \le g$, $k \neq i, j$, the relation (2.39) is independent of the relations among holomorphic quadratic differentials. This case occurs if and only if the curve C is trigonal or a smooth quintic.

3. Combinatorics of determinants

Let us fix a surjection $m : I_g \times I_g \to I_M$, satisfying

$$m(i,j) = m(j,i) \ , \tag{3.1}$$

$i, j \in I_g$. Such a surjection corresponds to an isomorphism $\mathbb{C}^M \to \mathrm{Sym}^2\mathbb{C}^g$ with $\tilde{e}_{m(i,j)} \mapsto e_i \cdot e_j$. For example, by using the construction of section 2.1, it is possible to define m so that $m(\mathtt{1}_i, \mathtt{2}_i) = m(\mathtt{2}_i, \mathtt{1}_i) = i$, $i \in I_M$; the corresponding isomorphism is A, defined in Definition 2.3.

For each morphism $s : I_M \to I_M$ consider the g-tuples $d^k(s)$, $k \in I_{g+1}$, given by

$$d^i_j(s) = d^{j+1}_i(s) := s_{m(i,j)} \ , \tag{3.2}$$

$i \leq j$, $i, j \in I_g$. Note that if s is a monomorphism, then each g-tuple consists of distinct integers, and each $i \in I_M$ belongs to two distinct g-tuples.

Consider $\mathcal{P}_g^{g+1} \equiv \underbrace{\mathcal{P}_g \times \cdots \times \mathcal{P}_g}_{g+1 \text{ times}}$ and define $\varkappa : \mathcal{P}_g^{g+1} \times I_M \to I_M$, depending on m, by

$$\varkappa_{m(i,j)}(r^1, \ldots, r^{g+1}) = m(r^i_j, r^{j+1}_i) \ , \tag{3.3}$$

$i \leq j$, $i, j \in I_g$, where $(r^1, \ldots, r^{g+1}) \in \mathcal{P}_g^{g+1}$. Note that

$$d^i_j(\varkappa(r^1, \ldots, r^{g+1})) = d^{j+1}_i(\varkappa(r^1, \ldots, r^{g+1})) = m(r^i_j, r^{j+1}_i) \ ,$$

$i \leq j$, $i, j \in I_g$. Consider the subset of I_M determined by

$$I_{M,n} := \{m(i,j) | i \in I_n, \ j \in I_g\} \ ,$$

$n \in I_g$, with the ordering inherited from I_M, and denote by

$$L := M - (g-n)(g-n+1)/2 \ ,$$

its cardinality. The elements $\varkappa_l(r^1, \ldots, r^{g+1})$, $l \in I_{M,n}$, are independent of r^j_i, with $n+1 \leq i, j \leq g$, and $\varkappa$ can be generalized to a function $\varkappa : I_{M,n} \times \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{g,n} \to I_M$, where $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{g,n} := \mathcal{P}_g^n \times \mathcal{P}_n^{g-n+1}$, by

$$\varkappa_i(\tilde{r}^1, \ldots, \tilde{r}^{g+1}) := \varkappa_i(r^1, \ldots, r^{g+1}) \ , \tag{3.4}$$

$i \in I_{M,n}$, $(\tilde{r}^1, \ldots, \tilde{r}^{g+1}) \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{g,n}$, where $r^j \in \mathcal{P}_g$, $j \in I_{g+1}$, are permutations satisfying $r^j = \tilde{r}^j$, $j \in I_n$, and $r^j_i = \tilde{r}^j_i$, $i \in I_n$, $n+1 \leq j \leq g$. Furthermore, if $\{\varkappa_i(\tilde{r}^1, \ldots, \tilde{r}^{g+1})\}_{i \in I_{M,n}}$ consists of distinct elements, then it is a permutation of $I_{M,n}$. By a suitable choice of the surjection

$$m(j,i) = m(i,j) := M - (g-j)(g-j-1)/2 + i \ , \tag{3.5}$$

$j \leq i \in I_g$, we obtain $I_{M,n} = I_L$ as an equality between ordered sets. Note that this choice for m, which is convenient to keep the notation uncluttered, does not correspond to the isomorphism introduced in subsection 2.1.

Consider the maps $s : I \to I$, where I is any ordered subset of I_M; if s is bijective, then it is a permutation of I. We define the function $\epsilon(s)$ to be the sign of the permutation if s is bijective, and zero otherwise.

Let F be a commutative field and S a non-empty set. Fix a set $\{f_i\}_{i\in I_g}$, of F-valued functions on S, and M (possibly coincident) elements $x_i \in S$, $i \in I_M$. Set

$$ff_{m(i,j)} := f_i f_j \ ,$$

$i, j \in I_g$, and

$$\det f(x_{d^j(s)}) := \det{}_{ik} \, f_k(x_{d^j_i(s)}) \ ,$$

$j \in I_{g+1}$, where $x_i \in S$, $i \in I_M$. Furthermore, for any ordered set $I \subseteq I_M$, we denote by

$$\det{}_I \, ff(x_1, \ldots, x_{\mathrm{Card}(I)}) \ ,$$

the determinant of the matrix $(ff_m(x_i))_{\substack{i\in I_{\mathrm{Card}(I)} \\ m\in I}}$.

Lemma 3.1. *Choose $n \in I_g$ and L elements x_i in S, $i \in I_L$. Fix $g-n$ elements $p_i \in S$, $n+1 \le i \le g$ and g F-valued functions f_i on S, $i \in I_g$. The following $g(g-n)$ conditions*

$$f_i(p_j) = \delta_{ij} \ , \tag{3.6}$$

$1 \le i \le j$, $n+1 \le j \le g$, imply

$$\det{}_{I_{M,n}} \, ff(x_1, \ldots, x_L) = \frac{1}{c_{g,n}} \sum_{s\in\mathcal{P}_L} \epsilon(s) \prod_{j=1}^{n} \det f(x_{d^j(s)}) \prod_{k=n+1}^{g+1} \det f(x_{d^k_1(s)}, \ldots, x_{d^k_n(s)}, p_{n+1}, \ldots, p_g) \tag{3.7}$$

where

$$c_{g,n} := \sum_{(\tilde{r}^1,\ldots,\tilde{r}^{g+1})\in\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{g,n}} \prod_{k=1}^{g+1} \epsilon(\tilde{r}^k) \epsilon(\varkappa(\tilde{r}^1, \ldots, \tilde{r}^{g+1})) \ . \tag{3.8}$$

In particular, for $n = g$

$$c_g \det ff(x_1, \ldots, x_M) = \sum_{s\in\mathcal{P}_M} \epsilon(s) \prod_{j=1}^{g+1} \det f(x_{d^j(s)}) \ , \tag{3.9}$$

where

$$c_g := c_{g,g} = \sum_{r^1,\ldots,r^{g+1}\in\mathcal{P}_g} \prod_{k=1}^{g} \epsilon(r^k) \, \epsilon(\varkappa(r^1, \ldots, r^g)) \ .$$

Proof. It is convenient to fix the surjection m as in (3.5), so that $I_{M,n} = I_L$. Next consider

$$c_{g,n} \det{}_{I_L} \, ff(x_1, \ldots, x_L) = c_{g,n} \sum_{s\in\mathcal{P}_L} \epsilon(s) ff_1(x_{s_1}) \cdots ff_L(x_{s_L}) \ . \tag{3.10}$$

Restrict the sums in (3.8) to the permutations $(\tilde{r}^1, \ldots, \tilde{r}^{g+1}) \in \mathcal{P}^{g,n}$, $i \in I_n$, such that $\epsilon(\varkappa(\tilde{r}^1, \ldots, \tilde{r}^{g+1})) \neq 0$, and set $s' := s \circ \varkappa(\tilde{r}^1, \ldots, \tilde{r}^{g+1})$, so that

$$ff_1(x_{s_1}) \cdots ff_L(x_{s_L}) = ff_{\varkappa_1}(x_{s'_1}) \cdots ff_{\varkappa_L}(x_{s'_L}) ,$$

where $\varkappa_i$ is to be understood as $\varkappa_i(\tilde{r}^1, \ldots, \tilde{r}^{g+1})$. Note that, for all $l \in I_M$, there is a unique pair $i, j \in I_g$, $i \leq j$, such that $l = m(i,j)$, and by (3.2) and (3.3) the following identity

$$ff_{\varkappa_l(r^1,\ldots,r^{g+1})}(x_{s'_l}) = ff_{m(r^i_j, r^{j+1}_i)}(x_{s'_{m(i,j)}}) = f_{r^i_j}(x_{d^i_j(s')}) f_{r^{j+1}_i}(x_{d^{j+1}_i(s')}) ,$$

holds for all $(r^1, \ldots, r^{g+1}) \in \mathcal{P}^{g+1}_g$. On the other hand, if $l \in I_L$, then $i \leq n$ and by Eq.(3.4)

$$ff_1(x_{s_1}) \cdots ff_L(x_{s_L}) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} f_{\tilde{r}^i_1}(x_{d^i_1(s')}) \cdots f_{\tilde{r}^i_g}(x_{d^i_g(s')}) \prod_{j=n+1}^{g+1} f_{\tilde{r}^j_1}(x_{d^j_1(s')}) \cdots f_{\tilde{r}^j_n}(x_{d^j_n(s')}) .$$

The condition $f_i(p_j) = \delta_{ij}$, $i \leq j$, implies

$$\sum_{\tilde{r}^j \in \mathcal{P}_n} \epsilon(\tilde{r}^j) f_{\tilde{r}^j_1}(x_{d^j_1(s')}) \cdots f_{\tilde{r}^j_n}(x_{d^j_n(s')}) = \det f(x_{d^j_1(s')}, \ldots, x_{d^j_n(s')}, p_{n+1}, \ldots, p_g) ,$$

$n + 1 \leq j \leq g + 1$. Hence, Eq.(3.7) follows by replacing the sum over s with the sum over s' in (3.10), and using

$$\epsilon(s) = \epsilon(s')\, \epsilon(\varkappa(\tilde{r}^1, \ldots, \tilde{r}^{g+1})) .$$

Eq.(3.9) is an immediate consequence of (3.7). □

Remark 3.2. The summation over $\mathcal{P}_M$ in Eq.(3.9) yields a sum over $(g + 1)!$ identical terms, corresponding to permutations of the $g+1$ determinants in the product. Such an overcounting can be avoided by summing over the following subset of $\mathcal{P}_M$

$$\mathcal{P}'_M := \{s \in \mathcal{P}_M,\ s.t.\ s_1 = 1,\ s_2 < s_3 < \ldots < s_g,\ s_2 < s_i,\ g + 1 \leq i \leq 2g - 1\} ,$$

and by replacing c_g by $c_g/(g + 1)!$.

Direct computation gives

$$c_{g,1} = g! , \quad c_{g,2} = g!(g - 1)!(2g - 1) , \quad c_2 = 6 , \quad c_3 = 360 , \quad c_4 = 302400 . \tag{3.11}$$

For $g = 2$, $c_g/(g + 1)! = 1$ and $\mathcal{P}'_{M=3} = \{(1, 2, 3)\}$, so that

$$\det ff(x_1, x_2, x_3) = \det f(x_1, x_2) \det f(x_1, x_3) \det f(x_2, x_3) . \tag{3.12}$$

A crucial point in proving Lemma 3.1 is that if $\varkappa_i(\tilde{r}^1, \ldots, \tilde{r}^{g+1})$, $i \in I_{M,n}$, are pairwise distinct elements in I_M, then they belong to $I_{M,n} \subseteq I_M$, with $\varkappa$ a permutation of such an ordered set. For a generic ordered set $I \subseteq I_M$, one should consider $\varkappa$ as a function over $g + 1$ permutations $\tilde{r}^i$, $i \in I_{g+1}$, of suitable ordered subsets of I_g. In particular, $\tilde{r}^i$ should be a permutation over all the elements $j \in I_g$ such that $m(i, j) \in I$, for $j \geq i$, or $m(i-1, j) \in I$, for $j < i$. However, the condition that the elements $\varkappa_i(\tilde{r}^1, \ldots, \tilde{r}^{g+1})$, $i \in I$, are pairwise distinct does not imply, in general, that they belong to I and Lemma 3.1 cannot be generalized to a determinant of products ff_i, $i \in I$. On the other hand, the subsets

$$I := I_{M,n} \cup \{m(i,j)\} \ , \tag{3.13}$$

satisfy such a condition for $n < i, j \leq g$ and yield the following generalization of Lemma 3.1.

Lemma 3.3. *Assume the hypotheses of Lemma* 3.1 *for $n < g$, and choose an element $x_{L+1} \in S$, and a pair i, j, $n < i, j \leq g$. Then the following relation*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\det{}_I\, ff(x_1, \dots, x_{L+1}) \\
&= \frac{1}{c'_{g,n}} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{P}_{L+1}} \epsilon(s) \prod_{k=1}^{n} \det f(x_{d^k(s)}) \det f(x_{d_1^{n+1}(s)}, \dots, x_{d_{n+1}^{n+1}(s)}, p_{n+1}, \dots, \check{p}_i, \dots, p_g) \\
&\cdot \det f(x_{d_1^{n+2}(s)}, \dots, x_{d_{n+1}^{n+2}(s)}, p_{n+1}, \dots, \check{p}_j, \dots, p_g) \prod_{l=n+3}^{g+1} \det f(x_{d_1^l(s)}, \dots, x_{d_n^l(s)}, p_{n+1}, \dots, p_g) \ ,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

where

$$c'_{g,n} := \sum_{(\tilde{r}^1, \dots, \tilde{r}^{g+1}) \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^I} \prod_{i=1}^{g+1} \epsilon(\tilde{r}^i) \epsilon(\varkappa(\tilde{r}^1, \dots, \tilde{r}^{g+1})) \ ,$$

$\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^I := \mathcal{P}_g^n \times \mathcal{P}_{n+1}^2 \times \mathcal{P}_n^{g-n-1}$, *and I is defined in* (3.13), *holds.*

Proof. A straightforward generalization of the proof of Lemma 3.1. □

4. Determinantal relations and combinatorial θ identities

Set $\mathcal{A}_Z := \mathbb{C}^g / L_Z$, $L_Z := \mathbb{Z}^g + Z\mathbb{Z}^g$, where Z belongs to the Siegel upper half-space

$$\mathfrak{H}_g := \{Z \in M_g(\mathbb{C}) |\, {}^t Z = Z, \, \mathrm{Im}\, Z > 0\} \ ,$$

and consider the theta function with characteristics

$$\begin{aligned}
\theta \left[\begin{smallmatrix} a \\ b \end{smallmatrix}\right](z, Z) : &= \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^g} e^{\pi i\, {}^t(k+a) Z (k+a) + 2\pi i\, {}^t(k+a)(z+b)} \\
&= e^{\pi i\, {}^t a Z a + 2\pi i\, {}^t a (z+b)} \theta \left[\begin{smallmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right](z + b + Za, Z) \ ,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

where $z \in \mathcal{A}_Z$, $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^g$. It has the quasi-periodicity properties

$$\theta \left[\begin{smallmatrix} a \\ b \end{smallmatrix}\right](z + n + Zm, Z) = e^{-\pi i\, {}^t m Z m - 2\pi i\, {}^t m z + 2\pi i ({}^t a n - {}^t b m)} \theta \left[\begin{smallmatrix} a \\ b \end{smallmatrix}\right](z, Z) \ ,$$

$m, n \in \mathbb{Z}^g$. Denote by $\Theta \subset \mathcal{A}_Z$ the divisor of $\theta(z, Z) := \theta \left[\begin{smallmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right](z, Z)$ and by $\Theta_s \subset \Theta$ the locus where θ and its gradient vanish. Geometrically $\theta \left[\begin{smallmatrix} a \\ b \end{smallmatrix}\right](z, Z)$ is the unique holomorphic section of the bundle $\mathcal{L}_{\Theta_{ab}}$ on $\mathcal{A}_Z$ defined by the divisor $\Theta_{ab} = \Theta + b + Za$ of $\theta \left[\begin{smallmatrix} a \\ b \end{smallmatrix}\right](z, Z)$. A suitable norm, continuous throughout $\mathcal{A}_Z$, is given by

$$||\theta||^2 (z, Z) = e^{-2\pi\, {}^t \mathrm{Im}\, z (\mathrm{Im}\, Z)^{-1} \mathrm{Im}\, \bar{z}} |\theta|^2 (z, Z) \ .$$

Computing $c_1(\mathcal{L}_\Theta)$ and using the Hirzebruch-Riemann-Roch Theorem, it can be proved that θ is the unique holomorphic section of $\mathcal{L}_\Theta$. It follows that $(\mathcal{A}_Z, \mathcal{L}_\Theta)$ is a principally polarized abelian variety.

4.1. Riemann theta functions and prime form

Let $\{\alpha,\beta\}\equiv\{\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_g,\beta_1,\ldots,\beta_g\}$ be a symplectic basis of $H_1(C,\mathbb{Z})$ and $\{\omega_i\}_{i\in I_g}$ the basis of $H^0(K_C)$ satisfying the standard normalization condition $\oint_{\alpha_i}\omega_j=\delta_{ij}$, for all $i,j\in I_g$. Let $\tau\in\mathfrak{H}_g$ be the Riemann period matrix of C, $\tau_{ij}:=\oint_{\beta_i}\omega_j$. A different choice of the symplectic basis of $H_1(C,\mathbb{Z})$ corresponds to a $\Gamma_g:=Sp(2g,\mathbb{Z})$ transformation

$$\begin{pmatrix}\alpha\\ \beta\end{pmatrix}\mapsto\begin{pmatrix}\tilde\alpha\\ \tilde\beta\end{pmatrix}=\begin{pmatrix}D & C\\ B & A\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}\alpha\\ \beta\end{pmatrix}\ ,\qquad\qquad \begin{pmatrix}A & B\\ C & D\end{pmatrix}\in\Gamma_g\ ,$$

$$\tau\mapsto\tau'=(A\tau+B)(C\tau+D)^{-1}\ . \tag{4.2}$$

Choose an arbitrary point $p_0\in C$ and let $I(p):=(I_1(p),\ldots,I_g(p))$

$$I_i(p):=\int_{p_0}^p\omega_i\ ,$$

$p\in C$, be the Abel-Jacobi map. It embeds C into the Jacobian $J_0(C):=\mathbb{C}^g/L_\tau$, $L_\tau:=\mathbb{Z}^g+\tau\mathbb{Z}^g$, and generalizes to a map from the space of divisors of C into $J_0(C)$ as $I(\sum_i n_ip_i):=\sum_i n_iI(p_i)$, $p_i\in C$, $n_i\in\mathbb{Z}$. By Jacobi Inversion Theorem the restriction of I to C_g is a surjective map onto $J_0(C)$.

If $\delta',\delta''\in\{0,1/2\}^g$, then $\theta\left[\delta\right](z,\tau):=\theta\left[\begin{smallmatrix}\delta'\\ \delta''\end{smallmatrix}\right](z,\tau)$ has definite parity in z

$$\theta\left[\delta\right](-z,\tau)=e(\delta)\theta\left[\delta\right](z,\tau)\ ,$$

where $e(\delta):=e^{4\pi i\,{}^t\delta'\delta''}$. There are 2^{2g} different characteristics of definite parity. By Abel Theorem each one of such theta characteristics determines the divisor class of a spin bundle $L_\alpha\simeq K_C^{\frac{1}{2}}$, so that we may call them spin structures. There are $2^{g-1}(2^g+1)$ even and $2^{g-1}(2^g-1)$ odd spin structures.

Consider the vector of Riemann constants

$$\mathcal{K}_i^p:=\frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{2}\tau_{ii}-\sum_{j\neq i}^g\oint_{\alpha_j}\omega_j\int_p^x\omega_i\ ,$$

$i\in I_g$, for all $p\in C$. For any p we define the Riemann divisor class by

$$I(\Delta):=(g-1)I(p)-\mathcal{K}^p\ ,$$

which has the property $2\Delta=K_C$.

In the following, we will consider $\theta(d+e):=\theta\left[\begin{smallmatrix}0\\ 0\end{smallmatrix}\right](I(d)+e,\tau)$, for all $e\in J_0(C)$, evaluated at some 0-degree divisor d of C. We will also use the notation

$$\theta_\Delta(d):=\theta(I(d-n\Delta))\ ,$$

for each divisor d of degree $n(g-1)$, $n\in\mathbb{Z}$.

According to the Riemann Vanishing Theorem, for any $p\in C$ and $e\in J_0(C)$

i. if $\theta(e)\neq 0$, then the divisor d of $\theta(x-p-e)$ in C is effective of degree g, with index of specialty $i(d)=0$ and $e=I(d-p-\Delta)$;

ii. if $\theta(e) = 0$, then for some $\zeta \in C_{g-1}$, $e = I(\zeta - \Delta)$.

The holomorphic 1-differential

$$h_\nu^2 := \sum_1^g \omega_i(p)\partial_{z_i}\theta\left[\nu\right](z)_{|z=0} \ , \tag{4.3}$$

where ν is an arbitrary non-singular odd spin structure, $p \in C$, has $g-1$ double zeros. The prime form

$$E(z,w) := \frac{\theta\left[\nu\right](w-z,\tau)}{h_\nu(z)h_\nu(w)} \ , \tag{4.4}$$

is a holomorphic section of a line bundle on $C \times C$, corresponding to a differential form of weight $(-1/2,-1/2)$ on $\tilde{C} \times \tilde{C}$, where $\tilde{C}$ is the universal cover of C. It has a first order zero along the diagonal of $C \times C$. In particular, if t is a local coordinate at $z \in C$ such that $h_\nu = dt$, then

$$E(z,w) = \frac{t(w)-t(z)}{\sqrt{dt(w)}\sqrt{dt(z)}}(1 + \mathcal{O}((t(w)-t(z))^2)) \ .$$

Note that $I(z + {}^t\alpha n + {}^t\beta m) = I(z) + n + \tau m$, $m,n \in \mathbb{Z}^g$, and

$$E(z + {}^t\alpha n + {}^t\beta m, w) = \chi e^{-\pi i\, {}^tm\tau m - 2\pi i\, {}^tmI(z-w)}E(z,w) \ ,$$

where $\chi := e^{2\pi i({}^t\nu' n - {}^t\nu'' m)} \in \{-1,+1\}$, $m,n \in \mathbb{Z}^g$.

We will also consider the multi-valued $g/2$-differential $\sigma(z)$ on C with empty divisor, that is a holomorphic section of a trivial bundle on C, and satisfies the property

$$\sigma(z + {}^t\alpha n + {}^t\beta m) = \chi^{-g}e^{\pi i(g-1)\,{}^tm\tau m + 2\pi i\,{}^tm\mathcal{K}^z}\sigma(z) \ .$$

This requirements fix $\sigma(z)$ only up to a factor independent of z; the precise definition, to which we will refer, can be given, following [28], on the universal covering of C (see also [29]). Furthermore,

$$\sigma(z,w) := \frac{\sigma(z)}{\sigma(w)} = \frac{\theta_\Delta(\sum_1^g x_i - z)}{\theta_\Delta(\sum_1^g x_i - w)}\prod_{i=1}^g \frac{E(x_i,w)}{E(x_i,z)} \ , \tag{4.5}$$

for all $z, w, x_1, \ldots, x_g \in C$, which follows by observing that the RHS is a nowhere vanishing section both in z and w with the same multi-valuedness of $\sigma(z)/\sigma(w)$.

4.2. Determinants and theta functions on algebraic curves

Set

$$S(p_1 + \ldots + p_g) := \frac{\theta_\Delta(\sum_1^g p_i - y)}{\sigma(y)\prod_1^g E(y,p_i)} \ , \tag{4.6}$$

$y, p_1, \ldots, p_g \in C$.

Lemma 4.1. *For all $p_1, \ldots, p_g \in C$, $S(p_1 + \ldots + p_g)$ is independent of y. For each fixed $d \in C_{g-1}$, consider the map $\pi_d : C \to C_g$, $\pi_d(p) := p + d$. The pull-back π_d^*S vanishes identically if and only if d is a special divisor; if d is not special, then π_d^*S is the unique (up to normalization) holomorphic 1/2-differential such that $[(\pi_d^*S) + d]$ is the canonical divisor class.*

Proof. If $p_1+\ldots+p_g$ is a special divisor, the Riemann Vanishing Theorem implies $S=0$ identically in y; if $p_1+\ldots+p_g$ is not special, S is a single-valued meromorphic section in y with no zero and no pole. It follows that, in any case, S is a constant in y. This also shows that $S(p_1+\ldots+p_g)=0$ if and only if $p_1+\ldots+p_g$ is a special divisor. Hence, if $d\in C_{g-1}$ is a special divisor, $S(p+d)=0$ for all $p\in C$. On the contrary, if d is not special, then $h^0(K_C\otimes\mathcal{O}(-d))=1$, and $S(p+d)=0$ if and only if p is one of the zeros of the (unique, up to a constant) holomorphic section of $H^0(K_C\otimes\mathcal{O}(-d))$, and this concludes the proof. $\square$

Proposition 4.2. *For each $n\in\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, let $\{\phi_i^n\}_{i\in I_{N_n}}$ be an arbitrary basis of $H^0(K_C^n)$. There are constants $\kappa[\phi^n]$ depending only on the marking of C and on $\{\phi_i^n\}_{i\in I_{N_n}}$ such that*

$$\kappa[\phi^1]=\frac{\det\phi_i^1(p_j)\sigma(y)\prod_1^g E(y,p_i)}{\theta_\Delta\big(\sum_1^g p_i-y\big)\prod_1^g\sigma(p_i)\prod_{i<j}^g E(p_i,p_j)}=\frac{\det\phi_i^1(p_j)}{S\big(\sum_1^g p_i\big)\prod_1^g\sigma(p_i)\prod_{i<j}^g E(p_i,p_j)}\ , \tag{4.7}$$

and

$$\kappa[\phi^n]=\frac{\det\phi_i^n(p_j)}{\theta_\Delta\big(\sum_1^{N_n}p_i\big)\prod_1^{N_n}\sigma(p_i)^{2n-1}\prod_{i<j}^{N_n}E(p_i,p_j)}\ , \tag{4.8}$$

for $n\geq 2$, for all $y,p_1,\ldots,p_{N_n}\in C$.

Proof. $\kappa[\phi^n]$ is a meromorphic function with empty divisor with respect to $y,p_1,\ldots,p_{N_n}$. $\square$

Proposition 4.3. *The identity*

$$\det\eta_i(x_j)=(-)^{g(g-1)/2}\kappa[\eta]\frac{S(\sum_1^g x_i)}{\prod_{i<j}^g E(x_i,x_j)}\prod_{k=1}^g\frac{\theta_\Delta(\sum_{i\neq k}^g x_i+y_k-x_k)}{S(\sum_{i\neq k}^g x_i+y_k)E(x_k,y_k)}$$

$$=(-)^{g(g-1)/2}\kappa[\eta]\frac{\prod_{k=1}^g\sum_{j=1}^g\theta_{\Delta,j}(\sum_{i\neq k}^g x_i)\omega_j(x_k)}{S(\sum_1^g x_i)^{g-1}\prod_{i<j}^g E(x_i,x_j)}\ , \tag{4.9}$$

holds for all $x_1,\ldots,x_g,y_1,\ldots,y_g\in C$. Furthermore, choose $n>1$ and let $\{\hat y_{m,j}\}_{\substack{0\leq m\leq 2n-2\\ j\in I_{g-1}}}$ be a set of points of C. The identity

$$\det\phi_i^n(x_j)=\frac{(-)^{N_n(N_n-1)/2}\kappa[\phi]\theta_\Delta(\sum_1^{N_n}x_i)}{\prod_{i<j}^{N_n}E(x_i,x_j)\prod_{l=0}^{2n-2}\big(S(\sum_{i=1}^{g-1}x_{l(g-1)+i}+y_l)^{2n-2}\prod_{k=1}^{N_n}E(x_k,y_l)\big)}$$

$$\cdot\prod_{m=0}^{2n-2}\prod_{j=1}^{g-1}\frac{\prod_{l=0}^{2n-2}\theta_\Delta(\sum_{i=1}^{g-1}x_{l(g-1)+i}+y_l-x_{m(g-1)+j}+\delta_{ml}(\hat y_{m,j}-x_{m(g-1)+j}))}{E(x_{m(g-1)+j},\hat y_{m,j})S(\sum_{i\neq j}^{g-1}x_{m(g-1)+i}+y_m+\hat y_{m,j})}$$

$$=\frac{(-)^{N_n(N_n+1)/2}\kappa[\phi]\theta_\Delta(\sum_1^{N_n}x_i)}{\prod_{i<j}^{N_n}E(x_i,x_j)\prod_{l=0}^{2n-2}\big(S(\sum_{i=1}^{g-1}x_{l(g-1)+i}+y_l)^{2n-1}\prod_{k=1}^{N_n}E(x_k,y_l)\big)}$$

$$\cdot\prod_{m=0}^{2n-2}\prod_{j=0}^{g-1}\Big(\sum_{k=1}^{g}\theta_{\Delta,k}\big(\sum_{\substack{i=1\\ i\neq j}}^{g-1}x_{m(g-1)+i}+y_m\big)\omega_k(x_{m(g-1)+j})\Big)\prod_{\substack{l=0\\ l\neq m}}^{2n-2}\theta_\Delta\big(\sum_{i=1}^{g-1}x_{l(g-1)+i}+y_l-x_{m(g-1)+j}\big)\ , \tag{4.10}$$

holds for all $x_1, \ldots, x_{N_n}, y_0, \ldots, y_{2n-2} \in C$.

Proof. By Eqs.(4.7) and (4.6)

$$\det \eta_i(x_j) = \kappa[\eta] S(\textstyle\sum_1^g x_i) \displaystyle\prod_{i<j}^{g} E(x_i, x_j) \prod_{k=1}^{g} \sigma(x_k) \ ,$$

and the first equality of (4.9) follows by

$$\sigma(x_k) = \frac{\theta_\Delta(\sum_{i\neq k}^g x_i + y_k - x_k)}{S(\sum_{i\neq k}^g x_i + y_k) E(x_k, y_k) \prod_{i\neq k}^g E(x_k, x_i)} \ ,$$

whereas the second equality follows by taking the limits $y_k \to x_k$. Eq.(4.10) follows by (4.8) and by observing that $\sigma(x_k)^{2n-1}$ can be factorized as

$$\sigma(x_{m(g-1)+j})^{2n-2} = \prod_{\substack{l=0\\ l\neq m}}^{2n-2} \frac{\theta_\Delta(\sum_{i=1}^{g-1} x_{l(g-1)+i} + y_l - x_{m(g-1)+j})}{\prod_{i=1}^{g-1} E(x_{m(g-1)+j}, x_{l(g-1)+i}) E(x_{m(g-1)+j}, y_l) S(\sum_{i=1}^{g-1} x_{l(g-1)+i} + y_l)} \ ,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(x_{m(g-1)+j}) =& \frac{\theta_\Delta(\sum_{i\neq j}^{g-1} x_{m(g-1)+i} + y_m + \hat{y}_{m,j} - x_{m(g-1)+j})}{\prod_{i\neq j}^{g-1} E(x_{m(g-1)+j}, x_{m(g-1)+i}) E(x_{m(g-1)+j}, \hat{y}_{m,j}) E(x_{m(g-1)+j}, y_m)} \\ & \cdot \frac{1}{S(\sum_{i\neq j}^{g-1} x_{m(g-1)+i} + y_m + \hat{y}_{m,j})} \ , \end{aligned}$$

where $0 \leq m \leq 2g-2$ and $j \in I_{g-1}$. The second equality follows by taking the limits $\hat{y}_{m,j} \to x_{m(g-1)+j}$, $0 \leq m \leq 2n-2$, $j \in I_{g-1}$. $\square$

Remark 4.4. By taking the limit $y \to z$ in Eq.(4.7), it follows that

$$\det \eta(z, p_1, \ldots, \check{p}_i, \ldots, p_g) = \kappa[\eta] \sum_{l=1}^{g} \theta_{\Delta,l}(\mathrm{a}_i) \omega_l(z) \prod_{\substack{j,k\neq i\\ j<k}} E(p_j, p_k) \prod_{j\neq i} \sigma(p_j) \ , \qquad (4.11)$$

for all $p_1, \ldots, p_{i-1}, z, p_{i+1}, \ldots, p_g \in C$, where $\theta_{\Delta,i}(e) := \partial_{z_i} \theta_\Delta(z)_{|z=e}$, $e \in \mathbb{C}^g$ and $\mathrm{a}_i := \sum_{k\neq i} p_k$, $i \in I_g$. Furthermore,

$$\theta(\mathcal{K}^w + w - z) = \frac{\sigma(z) E(z, w)^g}{\kappa[\omega] \sigma(w)^g} W[\omega](w) \ , \qquad (4.12)$$

for all $w, z \in C$, with $W[\omega](z)$ the Wronskian of $\{\omega_i\}_{i\in I_g}$ at z. Note that by (4.11) the condition $\det \eta_i(p_j) \neq 0$ implies

$$\sum_j \theta_{\Delta,j}(\mathrm{a}_i) \omega_j(p_i) \neq 0 \ , \qquad (4.13)$$

for all $i \in I_g$. On the other hand, the LHS of (4.13) is in $H^0(K_C)$, so that it may vanish either at the $2g-2$ points, or identically if $I(\mathrm{a}_i - \Delta) \in \Theta_s$, $i \in I_g$.

Proposition 4.5. *Let $p_1, \ldots, p_g \in C$ be points satisfying the condition $\det \eta_i(p_j) \neq 0$. Set $[\omega]_{ij} := \omega_i(p_j)$. We have*

$$[\omega]^{-1}_{ij} = \oint_{\alpha_j} \sigma_i = \frac{\theta_{\Delta,j}\left(\mathrm{a}_i\right)}{\sum_k \theta_{\Delta,k}\left(\mathrm{a}_i\right)\omega_k(p_i)} \ , \tag{4.14}$$

$i, j \in I_g$, so that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma_i(z) &= \sum_{j \in I_g} \frac{\theta_{\Delta,j}\left(\mathrm{a}_i\right)\omega_j(z)}{\sum_k \theta_{\Delta,k}\left(\mathrm{a}_i\right)\omega_k(p_i)} \\
&= \frac{\sigma(z,p_i)}{\sigma(x_i,y_i)} \frac{\theta_\Delta(\mathrm{a}_i + z - x_i)}{\theta_\Delta(\mathrm{a} - y_i)} \frac{E(y_i,p_i)}{E(x_i,z)} \prod_{j \neq i} \frac{E(y_i,p_j)E(z,p_j)}{E(x_i,p_j)E(p_i,p_j)} \\
&= \sigma(z,p_i) \frac{\theta_\Delta(\mathrm{a} + z - y - p_i)}{\theta_\Delta(\mathrm{a} - y)E(z,p_i)} \frac{E(y,p_i)}{E(y,z)} \prod_1^g E(z,p_j) \prod_{j \neq i} \frac{1}{E(p_i,p_j)} \ .
\end{aligned} \tag{4.15}$$

and

$$\kappa[\sigma] = \frac{\sigma(y)\prod_1^g E(y,p_i)}{\theta_\Delta(\mathrm{a} - y)\prod_{i<j}^g E(p_i,p_j)\prod_1^g \sigma(p_k)} \ , \tag{4.16}$$

for all $z, y, x_i, y_i \in C$, $i \in I_g$, where $\mathrm{a} := \sum_1^g p_i$, $\mathrm{a}_i := \mathrm{a} - p_i$, $i \in I_g$.

Proof. By (2.16) and (2.20) we have $\sigma_i = \sum_j [\omega]^{-1}_{ij}\omega_j$, and Eq.(4.14) follows by (4.7) and (4.11). Eqs.(4.15)(4.16) follow by (4.7) and by $\det \sigma_i(p_j) = 1$, respectively. □

Theorem 4.6. *Fix $g-2$ distinct points $p_3, \ldots, p_g \in C$ such that*

$$\{I(p + \mathrm{b} - \Delta) | p \in C\} \cap \Theta_s = \emptyset \ , \tag{4.17}$$

$\mathrm{b} := \sum_3^g p_i$. Then, for each $p_2 \in C \setminus \{p_3, \ldots, p_g\}$, there exists a finite set S, with $\{p_2, \ldots, p_g\} \subseteq S \subset C$, such that, for all $p_1 \in C \setminus S$, the quadratic differentials

$$v_i := \sum_{j=1}^M X^\omega_{ji}\, \omega\omega_j \ , \tag{4.18}$$

$i \in I_N$, with

$$X^\omega_{ij} := \frac{\theta_{\Delta,\mathbf{1}_j}(\mathrm{a}_{\mathbf{1}_i})\theta_{\Delta,\mathbf{2}_j}(\mathrm{a}_{\mathbf{2}_i}) + \theta_{\Delta,\mathbf{1}_j}(\mathrm{a}_{\mathbf{2}_i})\theta_{\Delta,\mathbf{2}_j}(\mathrm{a}_{\mathbf{1}_i})}{(1 + \delta_{\mathbf{1}_j \mathbf{2}_j})\sum_{l,m} \theta_{\Delta,l}(\mathrm{a}_{\mathbf{1}_i})\theta_{\Delta,m}(\mathrm{a}_{\mathbf{2}_i})\omega_l(p_{\mathbf{1}_i})\omega_m(p_{\mathbf{2}_i})} \ , \tag{4.19}$$

$i, j \in I_M$, where $\mathrm{a}_i := \sum_1^g p_k - p_i$, $i \in I_g$, are a Γ_g-invariant basis for $H^0(K_C^2)$. Furthermore, the $M - N$ independent linear relations

$$\sum_{j=1}^M C^\omega_{ij}\omega\omega_j = 0 \ , \tag{4.20}$$

$N + 1 \leq i \leq M$, hold, with

$$C^\omega_{ij} := \sum_{k_1,\ldots,k_N=1}^M |X^\omega|^{\,1\ \ \ldots\ \ N\, i}_{\,k_1 \ldots k_N\, j}\ \mathcal{R}_v[\omega\omega_{k_1}, \ldots, \omega\omega_{k_N}] \ . \tag{4.21}$$

X^ω_{ij} *and* C^ω_{ij} *correspond to the coefficients defined in (2.28) and (2.32), respectively, for* $\eta_i \equiv \omega_i$, $i \in I_g$.

Proof. After noting that $h^0(K_C \otimes \mathcal{O}(-b)) \geq 2$, fix a pair of linearly independent elements σ_1, σ_2 of $H^0(K_C \otimes \mathcal{O}(-b))$. Eq.(4.17) implies that $h^0(K_C \otimes \mathcal{O}(-b-p)) = 1$, for all $p \in C$, so that $\{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\}$ is a basis of $H^0(K_C \otimes \mathcal{O}(-b))$ and $\mathrm{supp}((\sigma_1) - b) \cap \mathrm{supp}((\sigma_2) - b)$ is empty. Fix $p_2 \in C \setminus \{p_3, \ldots, p_g\}$; without loss of generality, we can assume $\sigma_1 \in H^0(K_C \otimes \mathcal{O}(-b-p_2))$. Define the finite set S as the support of (σ_1) or, equivalently, as the union of $\{p_2, \ldots, p_g\}$ and the set of zeros of $S(x + p_2 + b)$. Then, for each $p_1 \in C \setminus S$, by choosing $\sigma_2 \in H^0(K_C \otimes \mathcal{O}(-b-p_1))$, we obtain that σ_1 and σ_2 are linearly independent. Then $p_1, \ldots, p_g$ satisfy the conditions *i)* and *ii)* of Proposition 2.6, and $\{v_i\}_{i \in I_N}$, as defined in (2.21), is a basis of $H^0(K_C^2)$. Eq.(4.14) implies that Eq.(4.19) is equivalent to (2.28), and the theorem follows by Theorem 2.9. □

A relation in the form (4.20) is well-known in literature

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^{g} \theta_{ij}(\pm e)\omega_i\omega_j(z) = 0 \ , \tag{4.22}$$

where $e \in \Theta_s$. On the other hand, for $g = 4$, $M - N = 1$, and the term $|X^\omega|^{\,1\,\ldots\,10}_{\,k_1\ldots 10} = \det X^\omega \neq 0$, in Eq.(4.20) factorizes. Hence, we obtain the unique relation

$$W[\omega\omega_1, \ldots, \omega\omega_{10}](p) = 0 \ ,$$

that compared with (4.22) gives

$$(\Delta_{kl}\theta_{ij} - \Delta_{ij}\theta_{kl})(\pm e) = 0 \ ,$$

$i, j, k, l \in I_4$, with $(-1)^k \Delta_{\mathfrak{1}_k \mathfrak{2}_k}$ the minor associated to the matrix element $\partial_p^9 \omega_{\mathfrak{1}_k}\omega_{\mathfrak{2}_k}(p)$ of $\partial_p^{j-1}\omega_{\mathfrak{1}_i}\omega_{\mathfrak{2}_i}(p)$.

Proposition 4.7. *Fix* g *points* $p_1, \ldots, p_g$ *satisfying the conditions of Proposition* 2.10 *(set* $i = 3$ *in the condition iii) of* 2.10*). The associated* 3*-differentials* $\{\varphi_i\}_{i \in I_M}$ *satisfy*

$$\varphi_i := \sum_{j=1}^{M_3} Y^\omega_{ji}\, \omega\omega\omega_j \ , \tag{4.23}$$

$i \in I_M$, *where*

$$Y^\omega_{ij} = \frac{(1 + \delta_{\mathfrak{1}_j \mathfrak{2}_j} + \delta_{\mathfrak{2}_j \mathfrak{3}_j})(1 + \delta_{\mathfrak{1}_j \mathfrak{3}_j})}{6 \prod_{\mathfrak{m} \in \{\mathfrak{1},\mathfrak{2},\mathfrak{3}\}} \sum_l \theta_{\Delta, l}(a_{\mathfrak{m}_i})\omega_l(p_{\mathfrak{m}_i})} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{P}_3} \Big(\prod_{\mathfrak{m} \in \{\mathfrak{1},\mathfrak{2},\mathfrak{3}\}} \theta_{\Delta, s(\mathfrak{m})_j}(a_{\mathfrak{m}_i}) \Big) \ , \tag{4.24}$$

$i, j \in I_M$, *correspond to the coefficients given in Eq.(2.41) in the case* $\eta = \omega$. *Furthermore, the following linear relations*

$$\sum_{j=1}^{M_3} D^\omega_{ij} \omega\omega\omega_j = 0 \ , \tag{4.25}$$

$N_3 + 1 \leq i \leq N_3 + g - 3$, *hold, where*

$$D^\omega_{ij} := \sum_{k_1, \ldots, k_{N_3} = 1}^{M_3} |Y^\omega|^{\,1\ \ldots\ N_3\ i}_{\,k_1 \ldots k_{N_3}\ j}\ \mathcal{R}_\varphi[\omega\omega\omega_{k_1}, \ldots, \omega\omega\omega_{k_{N_3}}] \ , \tag{4.26}$$

$j \in I_{M_3}$, $N_3 + 1 \leq i \leq N_3 + g - 3$, *correspond to the coefficients defined in Eq.(2.43).*

Proof. The proposition follows immediately by (2.41)(4.14) and by Proposition 2.11. □

4.3. Combinatorial theta identities on the canonical curve

Applying Lemmas 3.1 and 3.3 to determinants of symmetric products of holomorphic 1-differentials on a canonical curve C of genus g leads to combinatorial relations. By Eq.(4.7) and (4.8), such combinatorial relations yield non trivial identities among products of theta functions.

Proposition 4.8. *The following identities*

$$\det\eta\eta(x_1,x_2,x_3)=\det\eta(x_1,x_2)\det\eta(x_1,x_3)\det\eta(x_2,x_3)\ ,\qquad g=2\ ,\tag{4.27}$$

$$\det\eta\eta(x_1,\ldots,x_6)=\frac{1}{15}\sum_{s\in\mathcal{P}'_6}\epsilon(s)\prod_{i=1}^{4}\det\eta(x_{d^i_1(s)},x_{d^i_2(s)},x_{d^i_3(s)})\ ,\qquad g=3\ ,\tag{4.28}$$

$$\sum_{s\in\mathcal{P}_M}\epsilon(s)\prod_{i=1}^{g+1}\det\eta(x_{d^i(s)})=0\ ,\qquad g\geq 4\ ,\tag{4.29}$$

where $\{\eta_i\}_{i\in I_g}$ is an arbitrary basis of $H^0(K_C)$ and x_i, $i\in I_M$, are arbitrary points of C, hold. Furthermore, they are equivalent to

$$\det\eta\eta(x_1,x_2,x_3)=-\kappa[\eta]^3\frac{\prod_{i=1}^3\theta_\Delta(\sum_{j=1}^3 x_j-2x_i)\prod_1^3\sigma(x_j)}{\prod_{i<j}E(x_i,x_j)}\ ,\tag{4.30}$$

for $g=2$

$$\det\eta\eta(x_1,\ldots,x_6)=\frac{\kappa[\eta]^4}{15}\prod_{i=1}^{6}\sigma(x_i)^2\sum_{s\in\mathcal{P}'_6}\epsilon(s)\prod_{k=1}^{4}\frac{\theta_\Delta\big(\sum_{i=1}^3 x_{d^k_i(s)}-y_{k,s}\big)\prod_{i<j}^3E(x_{d^k_i(s)},x_{d^k_j(s)})}{\prod_{i=1}^3E(y_{k,s},x_{d^k_i(s)})\sigma(y_{k,s})}\ ,\tag{4.31}$$

for $g=3$

$$\frac{\kappa[\eta]^{g+1}}{c_g}\prod_{l=1}^{M}\sigma(x_l)^2\sum_{s\in\mathcal{P}_M}\epsilon(s)\prod_{k=1}^{g+1}\frac{\theta_\Delta\big(\sum_{i=1}^g x_{d^k_i(s)}-y_{k,s}\big)\prod_{i<j}^gE(x_{d^k_i(s)},x_{d^k_j(s)})}{\prod_{i=1}^gE(y_{k,s},x_{d^k_i(s)})\sigma(y_{k,s})}=0\ ,\tag{4.32}$$

for $g\geq 4$, where $y_{k,s}$, $k\in I_{g+1}$, $s\in\mathcal{P}_M$, are arbitrary points of C.

Proof. Eqs.(4.27)-(4.29) follow by applying Lemma 3.1 to $\det\eta\eta(x_1,\ldots,x_M)$ and noting that it vanishes for $g\geq 4$. Eqs.(4.30)-(4.32) then follow by Eq.(4.7). □

In [30] D'Hoker and Phong made the interesting observation that for $g=2$

$$\det\omega\omega(x_1,x_2,x_3)=\det\omega(x_1,x_2)\det\omega(x_1,x_3)\det\omega(x_2,x_3)\ ,\tag{4.33}$$

that proved by first expressing the holomorphic differentials in the explicit form and then using the product form of the Vandermonde determinant. Eq.(4.33) corresponds to (4.27) when the generic basis η_1,η_2 of $H^0(K_C)$ is the canonical one. On the other hand, the way (4.27) has been derived shows that (4.33) is an algebraic identity since it does not need the explicit hyperelliptic expression of ω_1 and ω_2. Eq.(4.33) is the first case of the general formulas, derived in Lemmas 3.1 and 3.3, expressing the determinant of the matrix $ff_i(x_j)$ in terms of a sum of permutations of products of determinants of the matrix $f_i(x_j)$. In particular, by (4.28), for $g = 3$ we have

$$\det \omega\omega(x_1, \dots, x_6) = \frac{1}{15} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{P}'_6} \epsilon(s) \prod_{i=1}^{4} \det \omega(x_{d^i(s)}) \ .$$

For $n < g$, a necessary condition for Eq.(3.7) to hold is the existence of the points p_i, $3 \leq i \leq g$, satisfying Eq.(3.6); in particular, Lemmas 3.1 and 3.3 can be applied to the basis $\{\sigma_i\}_{i \in I_g}$, of $H^0(K_C)$, defined in Eq.(2.20).

Theorem 4.9. *Fix the points* $p_1, \dots, p_g \in C$, *and* $\hat{\sigma}_i \in H^0(K_C)$, $i \in I_g$, *in such a way that* $\hat{\sigma}_i(p_j) = 0$, *for all* $i \neq j \in I_g$. *Define* $\hat{v}_i \in H^0(K_C^2)$, $i \in I_N$, *by*

$$\hat{v}_i := \psi(\hat{\sigma} \cdot \hat{\sigma}_i) = \hat{\sigma}_{1_i} \hat{\sigma}_{2_i} \ ,$$

and let $\{\eta_i\}_{i \in I_g}$ *be an arbitrary basis of* $H^0(K_C)$. *Then, the following identity*

$$\det \hat{v}(p_3, \dots, p_g, x_1, \dots, x_{2g-1}) \Big(\frac{\det \eta_i(p_j)}{\hat{\sigma}_1(p_1) \hat{\sigma}_2(p_2)} \Big)^{g+1} \prod_{i=3}^{g} \hat{\sigma}_i(p_i)^{-4}$$

$$= \frac{(-)^{g+1}}{c_{g,2}} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{P}_{2g-1}} \epsilon(s) \det \eta(x_{d^1(s)}) \det \eta(x_{d^2(s)}) \prod_{i=3}^{g+1} \det \eta(x_{d_1^i(s)}, x_{d_2^i(s)}, p_3, \dots, p_g) \ , \tag{4.34}$$

holds for all $x_1, \dots, x_{2g-1} \in C$, *where, according to (3.11),* $c_{g,2} = g!(g-1)!(2g-1)$.

Proof. Assume that $p_1, \dots, p_g$ satisfy the hypotheses of Proposition 2.5, so that $\{\hat{\sigma}_i\}_{i \in I_g}$ is a basis of $H^0(K_C)$ and $\hat{\sigma}_i(p_i) \neq 0$, for all $i \in I_g$. Since the points $p_1, \dots, p_g$ satisfying such a condition are a dense set in C^g, it suffices to prove Eq.(4.34) in this case and then conclude by continuity arguments. A relation analogous to (2.22) holds

$$v_i(p_j) = \begin{cases} \hat{\sigma}_i(p_i)^2 \delta_{ij} \ , & i \in I_g \ , \\ 0 \ , & g+1 \leq i \leq M \ , \end{cases}$$

$j \in I_g$, so that

$$\det \hat{v}(p_3, \dots, p_g, x_1, \dots, x_{2g-1}) = (-)^{g+1} \prod_{i=3}^{g} \hat{\sigma}_i(p_i)^2 \det_{I_{M,2}} \hat{\sigma}\hat{\sigma}(x_1, \dots, x_{2g-1}) \ .$$

By Lemma 3.1 for $n = 2$, $\det_{I_{M,2}} \hat{\sigma}\hat{\sigma}(x_1, \dots, x_{2g-1})$ is equal to the RHS of (3.7) divided by $\prod_{i=3}^{g} \hat{\sigma}_i(p_i)^{g-1}$. Eq.(4.34) then follows by the identity

$$\det \hat{\sigma}_i(z_j) = \frac{\det \eta_i(z_j)}{\det \eta_i(p_j)} \det \hat{\sigma}_i(p_j) = \frac{\det \eta_i(z_j)}{\det \eta_i(p_j)} \prod_{i=1}^{g} \hat{\sigma}_i(p_i) \ .$$

□

Remark 4.10. If $\det \eta_i(p_j) \neq 0$, then Theorem 4.9 holds for $\hat\sigma_i \equiv \sigma_i$, so that $\hat\sigma_i(p_i) = 1$, $i \in I_g$, and $\hat v_i \equiv v_i$, $i \in I_N$.

Corollary 4.11. *Let* $b := \sum_{i=3}^g p_i$ *be a fixed divisor of* C *and define* $\hat v_i$, $i \in I_N$, *as in Theorem 4.9. Then for all* $x_1, \ldots, x_N \in C$

$$\det \hat v(x_1, \ldots, x_N) = -\frac{F}{c_{g,2}} \frac{\theta_\Delta\big(\sum_1^N x_i\big) \prod_{i=2g}^N (\sigma(x_i)^3 \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} E(x_j, x_i))}{\theta_\Delta\big(\sum_1^{2g-1} x_i + \mathrm{b}\big) \prod_{i=3}^g \prod_{j=1}^{2g-1} E(p_i, x_j)} \prod_{i=1}^{2g-1} \sigma(x_i)^2$$

$$\cdot \sum_{s \in \mathcal{P}_{2g-1}} \epsilon(s) S\big(\sum_{i=1}^g x_{s_i}\big) S\big(\sum_{i=g}^{2g-1} x_{s_i}\big) \prod_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ i<j}}^g E(x_{s_i}, x_{s_j}) \prod_{\substack{i,j=g \\ i<j}}^{2g-1} E(x_{s_i}, x_{s_j}) \tag{4.35}$$

$$\cdot \prod_{k=1}^{g-1} \Big(S(x_{s_k} + x_{s_{k+g}} + \mathrm{b}) E(x_{s_k}, x_{s_{k+g}}) \prod_{i=3}^g E(x_{s_k}, p_i) E(x_{s_{k+g}}, p_i) \Big) ,$$

where $F \equiv F(p_1, \ldots, p_g)$ *is*

$$F := \Big(\frac{\hat\sigma_1(p_1) \hat\sigma_2(p_2)}{S(\mathrm{a}) \sigma(p_1) \sigma(p_2) E(p_1, p_2)} \Big)^{g+1} \prod_{i=3}^g \frac{\hat\sigma_i(p_i)^4}{\sigma(p_i)^5 (E(p_1, p_i) E(p_2, p_i))^{g+1} \prod_{j>i}^g E(p_i, p_j)^3} .$$

Proof. Apply Eq.(4.34) to

$$\det \hat v(x_1, \ldots, x_N) = \frac{\det \rho(x_1, \ldots, x_N)}{\det \rho(p_3, \ldots, p_g, x_1, \ldots, x_{2g-1})} \det \hat v(p_3, \ldots, p_g, x_1, \ldots, x_{2g-1}) ,$$

with $\{\rho_i\}_{i \in I_N}$ an arbitrary basis of $H^0(K_C^2)$. Eq.(4.35) then follows by Eqs.(4.7)(4.8). □

Theorem 4.12. *Fix* $p_1 \ldots, p_g \in C$. *The function* $H \equiv H(p_1, \ldots, p_g)$

$$H := \frac{S(\mathrm{a})^{5g-7} E(p_1, p_2)^{g+1}}{\theta_\Delta\big(\mathrm{b} + \sum_1^{2g-1} x_i\big) \prod_{i=1}^{2g-1} \sigma(x_i)} \prod_{i=3}^g \frac{E(p_1, p_i)^4 E(p_2, p_i)^4 \prod_{j>i}^g E(p_i, p_j)^5}{\sigma(p_i)}$$

$$\cdot \sum_{s \in \mathcal{P}_{2g-1}} \frac{S\big(\sum_{i=1}^g x_{s_i}\big) S\big(\sum_{i=g}^{2g-1} x_{s_i}\big)}{\prod_{i=3}^g E(x_{s_g}, p_i)} \prod_{i=1}^{g-1} \frac{S(x_{s_i} + x_{s_{i+g}} + \mathrm{b})}{\prod_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^{g-1} E(x_{s_i}, x_{s_{j+g}})} , \tag{4.36}$$

is independent of the points $x_1, \ldots, x_{2g-1} \in C$. *Furthermore, the set* $\{v_i\}_{i \in I_N}$, *defined as in* (2.21), *is a basis of* $H^0(K_C^2)$ *if and only if* $H \neq 0$.

Proof. Consider the holomorphic 1-differentials

$$\hat\sigma_i(z) := A_i^{-1} \sigma(z) S(\mathrm{a}_i + z) \prod_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^g E(z, p_j) = A_i^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^g \theta_{\Delta, j}(\mathrm{a}_i) \omega_j(z) ,$$

$i \in I_g$, $\mathrm{a}_i := \mathrm{a} - p_i$, with $A_1, \ldots, A_g$ non-vanishing constants. Such differentials are independent of y and if the points $p_1, \ldots, p_g$ satisfy the hypotheses of Proposition 2.5, then $\{\hat{\sigma}_i\}_{i \in I_g}$ corresponds, up to a non-singular diagonal transformation, to the basis defined in (2.20). Let $\{\rho_i\}_{i \in I_N}$ be an arbitrary basis of $H^0(K_C^2)$. By (4.8) the following identity

$$\begin{aligned}
&\det \rho(p_3, \ldots, p_g, x_1, \ldots, x_{2g-1}) \\
&= \kappa[\rho]\epsilon(s) \prod_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ i<j}}^{2g-1} E(x_{s_i}, x_{s_j}) \theta_\Delta\Big(\sum_1^{2g-1} x_i + b\Big) \prod_{i=1}^{2g-1} \sigma(x_i)^3 \prod_{i=3}^{g} \sigma(p_i)^3 \prod_{\substack{i,j=3 \\ i<j}}^{g} E(p_i, p_j) \prod_{i=3}^{g} \prod_{j=1}^{2g-1} E(p_i, x_j) \ ,
\end{aligned}$$

holds for all $s \in \mathcal{P}_{2g-1}$. Together with Eq.(4.35) and the above expression for $\hat{\sigma}_i$, it implies that

$$H = \kappa[\rho] c_{g,2} (A_1 A_2)^{g+1} \prod_{i=3}^{g} A_i^4 \frac{\det \hat{v}(p_3, \ldots, p_g, x_1, \ldots, x_{2g-1})}{\det \rho(p_3, \ldots, p_g, x_1, \ldots, x_{2g-1})} \ . \tag{4.37}$$

Hence, H is independent of $x_1, \ldots, x_{2g-1}$, and $H \neq 0$ if and only if $\{\hat{v}_i\}_{i \in I_N}$ is a basis of $H^0(K_C^2)$. On the other hand the vector $(\hat{v}_1, \ldots, \hat{v}_N)$ corresponds, up to a non-singular diagonal transformation, to $(v_1, \ldots, v_N)$, with v_i, $i \in I_N$, defined in (2.21). □

Remark 4.13. By (4.37)

$$\kappa[\hat{v}] = \frac{H(p_1, \ldots, p_g)}{c_{g,2}(A_1 A_2)^{g+1} \prod_{i=3}^{g} A_i^4} \ .$$

Furthermore, if $(p_1, \ldots, p_g) \notin \mathcal{A}$, then one can choose

$$A_i = \sigma(p_i) S(\mathrm{a}) \prod_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^{g} E(p_i, p_j) = \sum_{j=1}^{g} \theta_{\Delta,j}(\mathrm{a}_i) \omega_j(p_i) \ ,$$

to obtain $\hat{\sigma}_i \equiv \sigma_i$, $i \in I_g$, and

$$\begin{aligned}
\kappa[v] &= \frac{H(p_1, \ldots, p_g)}{c_{g,2} \prod_{i=1}^{2} \big(\sum_{j=1}^{g} \theta_{\Delta,j}(\mathrm{a}_i)\omega_j(p_i)\big)^{g+1} \prod_{i=3}^{g} \big(\sum_{j=1}^{g} \theta_{\Delta,j}(\mathrm{a}_i)\omega_j(p_i)\big)^4} \\
&= \frac{H(p_1, \ldots, p_g)}{c_{g,2} S(\mathrm{a})^{6g-6} \prod_{i=1}^{2} \big(\sigma(p_i) \prod_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^{g} E(p_i, p_j)\big)^{g+1} \prod_{i=3}^{g} \big(\sigma(p_i) \prod_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^{g} E(p_i, p_j)\big)^4} \ .
\end{aligned} \tag{4.38}$$

Corollary 4.14. *The function*

$$\begin{aligned}
K(p_3, \ldots, p_g) :=& \frac{1}{\theta_\Delta\big(b + \sum_1^{2g-1} x_i\big) \prod_1^{2g-1} \sigma(x_i) \prod_{i=3}^{g} \sigma(p_i)} \\
&\cdot \sum_{s \in \mathcal{P}_{2g-1}} \frac{S\big(\sum_{i=1}^{g} x_{s_i}\big) S\big(\sum_{i=g}^{2g-1} x_{s_i}\big)}{\prod_{i=3}^{g} E(x_{s_g}, p_i)} \prod_{i=1}^{g-1} \frac{S(x_{s_i} + x_{s_{i+g}} + b)}{\prod_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^{g-1} E(x_{s_i}, x_{s_{j+g}})} \ ,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.39}$$

is independent of $x_1, \ldots, x_{2g-1} \in C$*. Furthermore, for any* $p_1, \ldots, p_g \in C$ *such that* $\det \eta_i(p_j) \neq 0$*, the set* $\{v_i\}_{i \in I_N}$*, defined in* (2.21)*, is a basis of* $H^0(K_C^2)$ *if and only if* $K \neq 0$*.*

Proof. The ratio

$$\frac{H}{K} = S(\mathrm{a})^{5g-7} E(p_1, p_2)^{g+1} \prod_{i=3}^{g} (E(p_1, p_i) E(p_2, p_i))^4 \prod_{\substack{i,j=3 \\ i<j}}^{g} E(p_i, p_j)^5 \ , \tag{4.40}$$

is independent of $x_1, \ldots, x_{2g-1}$, so that the first statement follows by Theorem 4.12 or, equivalently, noticing that by Eqs.(4.16)(4.36)(4.38) and (4.40)

$$K(p_3, \ldots, p_g) := (-)^{g+1} c_{g,2} \frac{\kappa[v]}{\kappa[\sigma]^{g+1}} \prod_{\substack{i,j=3 \\ i<j}}^{g} E(p_i, p_j)^{2-g} \prod_{i=3}^{g} \sigma(p_i)^{3-g} \ . \tag{4.41}$$

By (4.7)(4.6) and (4.40) the condition $\det \eta_i(p_j) \neq 0$ implies $H/K \neq 0$. In this case $K \neq 0$ if and only if $H \neq 0$, and the corollary follows by Theorem 4.12. □

Proof of theorem 1.1.

Fix i, j, $3 \leq i < j \leq g$, and choose p_1, p_2 in such a way that $\{\sigma_i\}_{i \in I_g}$ is a basis of $H^0(K_C)$. Observe that, due to Eq.(2.26), $\det_I \sigma\sigma(x_1, \ldots, x_{2g}) = 0$, for all $x_1, \ldots, x_{2g} \in C$, where $I := I_{M,2} \cup \{m(i,j)\}$. Applying Lemma 3.3, with $n = 2$, such an identity corresponds to Eq.(1.1) with the canonical basis $\{\omega_i\}_{i \in I_g}$ of $H^0(K_C)$ replaced by $\{\sigma_i\}_{i \in I_g}$. Eq.(1.1) is then obtained by changing the base. □

Proof of theorem 1.2.

By (4.7) $V_{ij}(p_3, \ldots, p_g, x_1, \ldots, x_{2g})$ is equivalent to (1.1). □

Note that $V_{ii} \neq 0$ for $i = 3, \ldots, g$, since the expression on the LHS is proportional to a determinant of $2g$ linearly independent holomorphic quadratic differentials on C, evaluated at general points $x_k \in C$, $k \in I_{2g}$.

Proof of corollary 1.3.

Consider the identity

$$\frac{\det_I \sigma\sigma(x_1, \ldots, x_{2g-1}, z)}{\det v(p_3, \ldots, p_g, x_1, \ldots, x_{2g-1})} = 0 \ , \tag{4.42}$$

$I := I_{M,2} \cup \{i\}$, $N + 1 \leq i \leq M$. Upon applying Lemma 3.3, with $n = 2$, and Eq.(4.7) to the numerator and Eq.(4.8) to the denominator of (4.42), Eq.(1.3) follows by a trivial computation. On the other hand, for arbitrary points $z, y_1, \ldots, y_{g-1} \in C$,

$$S(y_1 + \ldots + y_{g-1} + z) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{g} \theta_{\Delta,i}(y_1 + \ldots + y_{g-1}) \omega_i(z)}{\sigma(z) \prod_1^{g-1} E(z, y_i)} \ .$$

Upon replacing each term of the form $S(d_{g-1}+z)$ in $V_{\mathtt{1}_i\mathtt{2}_i}(p_3,\dots,p_g,x_1,\dots,x_{g-1},z)$ by its expression above, for any effective divisor d_{g-1} of degree $g-1$, the dependence on z only enters through $\omega_i\omega_j(z)$ and the relations (1.3) can be written in the form of Eq.(2.31). $\square$

5. Siegel metric on $\hat{\mathcal{M}}_g$ and Mumford isomorphism

The Torelli space $\mathcal{T}_g$ of smooth algebraic curves of genus g can be embedded in $\mathfrak{H}_g$ by the period mapping, which assigns to a curve C, with a fixed basis of $H_1(C,\mathbb{Z})$, representing a point in $\mathcal{T}_g$, the corresponding period matrix. The period mapping has maximal rank $3g-3$ on the subspace $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_g$ of non-hyperelliptic curves and therefore a metric on $\mathfrak{H}_g$ induces the pull-back metric on $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_g$. It is therefore natural to consider the Siegel metric on $\mathfrak{H}_g$ [31]

$$ds^2 := \mathrm{Tr}\,(Y^{-1}dZY^{-1}d\bar{Z}) \ , \tag{5.1}$$

where $Y := \mathrm{Im}\,Z$, $Z\in\mathfrak{H}_g$. Such a metric is $\mathrm{Sp}(2g,\mathbb{R})$ invariant, and since $\hat{\mathcal{M}}_g \cong \hat{\mathcal{T}}_g/\Gamma_g$, it also induces a metric on $\hat{\mathcal{M}}_g$. The Siegel volume form is [31]

$$d\nu = \frac{i^M}{2^g}\frac{\bigwedge_{i\le j}^g(\mathrm{d}Z_{ij}\wedge\mathrm{d}\bar{Z}_{ij})}{(\det Y)^{g+1}} \ . \tag{5.2}$$

Proposition 5.1. *The Siegel metric (5.1) can be equivalently expressed in the form*

$$ds^2 = \sum_{i,j=1}^M g^S_{ij}dZ_id\bar{Z}_j \ , \tag{5.3}$$

where

$$g^S_{ij}(Z,\bar{Z}) := 2\frac{Y^{-1}_{\mathtt{1}_i\mathtt{1}_j}Y^{-1}_{\mathtt{2}_i\mathtt{2}_j}+Y^{-1}_{\mathtt{1}_i\mathtt{2}_j}Y^{-1}_{\mathtt{2}_i\mathtt{1}_j}}{(1+\delta_{\mathtt{1}_i\mathtt{2}_i})(1+\delta_{\mathtt{1}_j\mathtt{2}_j})} = 2\chi_i^{-1}\chi_j^{-1}(Y^{-1}Y^{-1})_{ij} \ , \tag{5.4}$$

$i,j\in I_M$.

Proof. For $n=2$ the identity (2.10) reads

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^g f(i,j) = \sum_{k=1}^M(2-\delta_{\mathtt{1}_k\mathtt{2}_k})f(\mathtt{1}_k,\mathtt{2}_k) \ ,$$

where we used the identity

$$2-\delta_{ij} = \frac{2}{1+\delta_{ij}} \ .$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
ds^2 &= \sum_{i,j,k,l=1}^g Y^{-1}_{ij}dZ_{jk}Y^{-1}_{kl}d\bar{Z}_{li} \\
&= \sum_{i,j=1}^g d\bar{Z}_{ji}\sum_{m=1}^M\frac{Y^{-1}_{i\mathtt{1}_m}Y^{-1}_{j\mathtt{2}_m}+Y^{-1}_{i\mathtt{2}_m}Y^{-1}_{j\mathtt{1}_m}}{1+\delta_{\mathtt{1}_m\mathtt{2}_m}}dZ_{\mathtt{1}_m\mathtt{2}_m} \\
&= \sum_{m,n=1}^M(2-\delta_{\mathtt{1}_n\mathtt{2}_n})d\bar{Z}_{\mathtt{1}_n\mathtt{2}_n}\frac{Y^{-1}_{\mathtt{1}_n\mathtt{1}_m}Y^{-1}_{\mathtt{2}_n\mathtt{2}_m}+Y^{-1}_{\mathtt{1}_n\mathtt{2}_m}Y^{-1}_{\mathtt{2}_n\mathtt{1}_m}}{1+\delta_{\mathtt{1}_m\mathtt{2}_m}}dZ_{\mathtt{1}_m\mathtt{2}_m} \\
&= \sum_{m,n=1}^M 2\chi_m^{-1}\chi_n^{-1}(Y^{-1}Y^{-1})_{nm}dZ_md\bar{Z}_n \ .
\end{aligned} \tag{5.5}$$

□

Proof of theorem 1.4.

Proof. Consider the Kodaira-Spencer map k identifying the space of quadratic differentials on C with the fiber of the cotangent bundle of $\mathcal{M}_g$ at the point representing C. Next, consider a Beltrami differential $\mu \in \Gamma(\bar{K}_C \otimes K_C^{-1})$ (see [32] for explicit constructions) and recall that it defines a tangent vector at C of $\mathcal{T}_g$. The derivative of the period map $\tau_{ij} : \mathcal{T}_g \to \mathbb{C}$ at C in the direction of μ is given by Rauch's formula

$$d_C\tau_{ij}(\mu) = \int_C \mu\omega_i\omega_j \ .$$

It follows that

$$k(\omega_j\omega_k) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} d\tau_{jk} \ ,$$

$j, k \in I_g$, so that, by (4.18),

$$k(v_j) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \sum_{k=1}^{M} X^{\omega}_{kj} d\tau_k \ , \tag{5.6}$$

$j \in I_N$, where

$$d\tau_i := d\tau_{1_i 2_i} \ ,$$

$i \in I_M$. It follows that the differentials

$$\Xi_j := 2\pi i\, k(v_j) \ , \tag{5.7}$$

$j \in I_N$, are linearly independent. Furthermore, since by construction the basis $\{v_i\}_{i\in I_N}$ is independent of the choice of a symplectic basis of $H_1(C, \mathbb{Z})$, such differentials are modular invariant, i.e.

$$\Xi_i \ \mapsto \ \tilde{\Xi}_i = \Xi_i \ , \tag{5.8}$$

$i \in I_N$, under (4.2). □

Let $ds^2_{|\hat{\mathcal{M}}_g}$ be the metric on $\hat{\mathcal{M}}_g$ induced by the Siegel metric. Set

$$g^{\tau}_{ij} := g^{S}_{ij}(\tau, \bar{\tau}) = 2\chi_i^{-1}\chi_j^{-1}({\tau_2}^{-1}{\tau_2}^{-1})_{ij} \ . \tag{5.9}$$

Corollary 5.2.

$$ds^2_{|\hat{\mathcal{M}}_g} = \sum_{i,j=1}^{N} g^{\Xi}_{ij}\Xi_i\bar{\Xi}_j \ , \tag{5.10}$$

where

$$g^{\Xi}_{ij} := \sum_{k,l=1}^{M} g^{\tau}_{kl} B^{\omega}_{ik} \bar{B}^{\omega}_{jl} \ ,$$

and B^{ω} *is the matrix defined in* (2.35) *with* $\eta_i \equiv \omega_i$, $i \in I_g$.

Proof. By (5.3) and (5.4)

$$ds^2_{|\hat{\mathcal{M}}_g} = \sum_{k,l=1}^{M} g^\tau_{ij} d\tau_i d\bar{\tau}_j \ . \tag{5.11}$$

Furthermore, by applying the Kodaira-Spencer map to both sides of Eq.(2.34), one obtains

$$d\tau_i = \sum_{j=1}^{N} B^\omega_{ji}\, \Xi_j \ , \tag{5.12}$$

$i \in I_M$, and (5.10) follows. ☐

Proof of corollary 1.5.

By (5.10)

$$d\nu_{|\hat{\mathcal{M}}_g} = \left(\frac{i}{2}\right)^N \det g^\Xi \ \textstyle\bigwedge_1^N(\Xi_i \wedge \bar{\Xi}_i) \ , \tag{5.13}$$

and by Theorem 1.4 the corollary follows. ☐

The correspondence between Eq.(2.34) and Eq.(5.12), by means of the Kodaira-Spencer map, can be generalized in order to obtain non-trivial relations on the cotangent space of $\hat{\mathcal{M}}_g$ from relations among holomorphic quadratic differentials. For example, Eq.(4.22), together with the heat equation

$$\frac{\partial^2\theta}{\partial z_i \partial z_j}(z, Z) = 2\pi i(1 + \delta_{ij})\frac{\partial\theta}{\partial Z_{ij}}(z, Z) \ ,$$

$i, j \in I_g$, is equivalent to the vanishing of the exterior derivative in $\hat{\mathcal{M}}_g$ of $\theta(z, \tau)$ at $z = \pm e$, i.e.

$$d\theta(\pm e) = \sum_{i=1}^{M} \frac{\partial\theta}{\partial\tau_i}(\pm e) d\tau_i = 0 \ ,$$

$e \in \Theta_s$.

Application of the Kodaira-Spencer map to Eq.(4.20) immediately gives the linear relations satisfied by $d\tau_i$, $i \in I_M$.

Corollary 5.3. *The* $(g-2)(g-3)/2$ *linear relations*

$$\sum_{j=1}^{M} C^\omega_{ij} d\tau_j = 0 \ , \tag{5.14}$$

$N + 1 \le i \le M$, *where the matrices* C^ω *are defined in (4.21), hold.*

5.1. Combinatorial identities and the Mumford isomorphism

Let $\mathcal{C}_g \xrightarrow{\pi} \mathcal{M}_g$ be the universal curve over $\mathcal{M}_g$ and $L_n = R\pi_*(K^n_{\mathcal{C}_g/\mathcal{M}_g})$ the vector bundle on $\mathcal{M}_g$ of rank $(2n-1)(g-1)+\delta_{n1}$ with fiber $H^0(K^n_C)$ at the point of $\mathcal{M}_g$ representing C. Let

$$\lambda_n := \det L_n \ ,$$

be the determinant line bundle. According to Mumford [33]

$$\lambda_n \cong \lambda_1^{\otimes c_n} \ ,$$

where $c_n = 6n^2 - 6n + 1$, which corresponds to (minus) the central charge of the chiral $b-c$ system of conformal weight n [32]. The Mumford form $\mu_{g,n}$ is the unique, up to a constant, holomorphic section of $\lambda_n \otimes \lambda_1^{-\otimes c_n}$ nowhere vanishing on $\mathcal{M}_g$. Its explicit form has been derived in [34-37] and [28].

Theorem 5.4. *Let $\{\phi_i^n\}_{i\in I_{N_n}}$ be a basis of $H^0(K^n_C)$, $n \geq 2$. For any points $p, x_1, \ldots, x_{N_n} \in C$, the Mumford form is, up to a universal constant*

$$\mu_{g,n} = F_{g,n}[\phi^n]\frac{\phi_1^n \wedge \cdots \wedge \phi_{N_n}^n}{(\omega_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \omega_g)^{c_n}} \ ,$$

where

$$F_{g,n}[\phi^n] := \frac{\theta_\Delta\left(\sum_1^{N_n} x_i\right)\prod_{i<j}^{N_n} E(x_i,x_j)}{\det \phi_i^n(x_j)\prod_1^{N_n} c(x_i)^{\frac{2n-1}{g-1}}} = \frac{\theta((2n-1)\mathcal{K}^p)}{W[\phi^n](p)c(p)^{(2n-1)^2}} \ , \tag{5.15}$$

and

$$c(p) := \frac{\theta_\Delta\left(\sum_1^g x_i - y\right)\prod_1^g \sigma(x_i,p)\prod_{i<j} E(x_i,x_j)}{\det \omega_i(x_j)\sigma(y,p)\prod_1^g E(y,x_i)} = \frac{1}{\kappa[\omega]\sigma(p)^{g-1}} \ , \tag{5.16}$$

for all $p, x_1, \ldots, x_g, y \in C$.

It has been shown in [38][39] that

$$F_{2,2}[\omega\omega] = \frac{c_{2,2}}{\Psi_{10}(\tau)} \ , \tag{5.17}$$

where Ψ_{10} is the modular form of weight 10

$$\Psi_{10}(\tau) := \prod_{a,b\, even} \theta\left[\begin{smallmatrix}a\\b\end{smallmatrix}\right](0)^2 \ ,$$

where the product is over the 10 even characteristics of $g = 2$. It has been shown in [30] that $c_{2,2} = 1/\pi^{12}$. Furthermore, it has been conjectured that [38][39]

$$F_{3,2}[\omega\omega] = \frac{c_{3,2}}{\Psi_9(\tau)} \ , \tag{5.18}$$

with $\Psi_9(\tau)^2 \equiv \Psi_{18}(\tau)$

$$\Psi_{18}(\tau) := \prod_{a,b\, even} \theta\left[\begin{smallmatrix}a\\b\end{smallmatrix}\right](0) \ ,$$

where the product is over the 36 even characteristics of $g = 3$ and $c_{3,2} = 1/2^6\pi^{18}$ [40].

Proposition 5.5. *For* $g = 2$

$$\kappa[\omega]^6 = -\frac{1}{\pi^{12}}\frac{\theta_\Delta(x_1+x_2-x_3)\theta_\Delta(x_1+x_3-x_2)\theta_\Delta(x_2+x_3-x_1)}{\Psi_{10}(\tau)\theta_\Delta(x_1+x_2+x_3)[E(x_1,x_2)E(x_1,x_3)E(x_2,x_3)\sigma(x_1)\sigma(x_2)\sigma(x_3)]^2} \ . \tag{5.19}$$

For $g = 3$

$$\kappa[\omega]^5 = \frac{\sum_{s\in\mathcal{P}'_6}\epsilon(s)\prod_{k=1}^4[\theta_\Delta\big(\sum_{i=1}^3 x_{d_i^k(s)} - y\big)\prod_{i<j}^3 E(x_{d_i^k(s)}, x_{d_j^k(s)})]}{2^6 15\pi^{18}\Psi_9(\tau)\theta_\Delta\big(\sum_1^6 x_i\big)\prod_{i=1}^6\sigma(x_i)\sigma(y)^4\prod_{i=1}^6 E(y,x_i)^2\prod_{i<j}^6 E(x_i,x_j)} \ . \tag{5.20}$$

Furthermore, for $g = 2$

$$(\det\omega\omega_i(x_j))^2 = -\frac{1}{\pi^{12}}\frac{\prod_{i=1}^3\theta_\Delta(\sum_{j=1}^3 x_j - 2x_i)^3}{\Psi_{10}(\tau)\theta_\Delta(\sum_1^3 x_i)\prod_{i<j}E(x_i,x_j)^4} \ . \tag{5.21}$$

Proof. Eq.(5.19) follows by simply replacing the expression of $\det\omega\omega_i(x_j)$ in (4.30) in $F_{2,2}[\omega\omega]$, then use $c(x) = \sigma(x)^{1-g}/\kappa[\omega]$. Similarly, by (4.31)

$$\frac{\det\omega\omega(x_1,\ldots,x_6)}{\kappa[\omega]^4} = \frac{\prod_1^6\sigma(x_i)^2\sum_{s\in\mathcal{P}'_6}\epsilon(s)\prod_{k=1}^4[\theta_\Delta\big(\sum_{i=1}^3 x_{d_i^k(s)} - y\big)\prod_{i<j}^3 E(x_{d_i^k(s)}, x_{d_j^k(s)})]}{15\sigma(y)^4\prod_{i=1}^6 E(y,x_i)^2} \ ,$$

and (5.20) follows by the identity $\prod\limits_{i=1}^6 c(x_i)^{-\frac{3}{2}} = \kappa[\omega]^9\prod\limits_{i=1}^6\sigma(x_i)^3$. Eq.(5.21) follows by direct computation. ☐

Acknowledgements. Work partially supported by the European Community's Human Potential Programme under contract MRTN-CT-2004-005104 "Constituents, Fundamental Forces and Symmetries of the Universe".

References

[1] K. Petri, Über die invariante darstellung algebraischer funktionen einer veränderlichen, *Math. Ann.* **88** (1922), 242-289.

[2] E. Arbarello and E. Sernesi, Petri's approach to the study of the ideal associated to a special divisor, *Invent. Math.* **49** (1978), 99–119.

[3] E. Arbarello and J. Harris, Canonical curves and quadrics of rank 4, *Compos. Math.* **43** (1981), 145–179.

[4] D. Mumford, *The Red Book of Varieties and Schemes*, Springer Lecture Notes 1358 (1999).

[5] M. Matone and R. Volpato, Linear relations among holomorphic quadratic differentials and induced Siegel's metric on $\mathcal{M}_g$, arXiv:math.ag/0506550.

[6] M. Matone and R. Volpato, Higher genus superstring amplitudes from the geometry of moduli spaces, *Nucl. Phys.* B **732** (2006), 321-340 [arXiv:hep-th/0506231].

[7] E. D'Hoker and D. H. Phong, Two-loop superstrings. VI: Non-renormalization theorems and the 4-point function, *Nucl. Phys.* B **715** (2005), 3-90 [arXiv:hep-th/0501197].

[8] I. M. Krichever, Integration of non-linear equations by methods of algebraic geometry, *Funct. Anal. Appl.* **11** (1) (1977), 12-26.

[9] B. Dubrovin, Theta functions and non-linear equations, *Russ. Math. Surv.* **36** (1981), 11-92.

[10] M. Mulase, Cohomological structure in soliton equations and Jacobian varieties, *J. Diff. Geom.* **19** (1984), 403-430.

[11] T. Shiota, Characterization of Jacobian varieties in terms of soliton equations, *Invent. Math.* **83** (1986), 333-382.

[12] E. Arbarello and C. De Concini, Another proof of a conjecture of S.P. Novikov on periods of abelian integrals on Riemann surfaces, *Duke Math. Journal* **54** (1987), 163-178.

[13] R. Gunning, Some curves in abelian varieties, *Invent. Math.* **66** (1982), 377-389.

[14] G. E. Welters, A characterization of non-hyperelliptic Jacobi varieties, *Invent. Math.* **74** (1983), 437-440.

[15] G. E. Welters, A criterion for Jacobi varieties, *Ann. Math.* **120** (1984), 497-504.

[16] R. Donagi, The Schottky problem, In *Theory of moduli* (Montecatini Terme, 1985), 84-137, Springer Lecture Notes 1337.

[17] E. Arbarello and C. De Concini, On a set of equations characterizing Riemann matrices, *Ann. Math.* **120** (1984), 119–140.

[18] G. Marini, A geometrical proof of Shiota's Theorem on a conjecture of S.P. Novikov, *Compos. Math.* **111** (1998), 305-322.

[19] A. Polishchuk, *Abelian varieties, theta functions and the Fourier transform*, Cambridge Univ. Press, 2003.

[20] S. Grushevsky, The degree of the Jacobian locus and the Schottky problem, math.ag/0403009.

[21] S. Casalaina-Martin, Prym varieties and the Schottky problem for cubic threefolds, arXiv: math.ag/0605666.

[22] E. Arbarello, I. M. Krichever and G. Marini, Characterizing Jacobians via flexes of the Kummer variety, *Math. Res. Lett.* **13** (1) (2006), 109-123.

[23] I. M. Krichever, Integrable linear equations and the Riemann-Schottky problem, *Algebraic geometry and number theory*, 497-514, Progr. Math. 253, Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, 2006.

[24] S. Grushevsky and R. Salvati Manni, Jacobians with a vanishing theta-null in genus 4, arXiv:math.ag/0605160.

[25] I. M. Krichever, Characterizing Jacobians via trisecants of the Kummer variety, arXiv: math.ag/0605625.

[26] H. Farkas, Vanishing theta nulls and Jacobians, *The geometry of Riemann surfaces and abelian varieties*, 37-53, Contemp. Math. 397, 2006.

[27] E. Arbarello, M. Cornalba, P. A. Griffiths and J. Harris, *Geometry of Algebraic Curves*, Vol.1, Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, New-York, Tokyo, (1985).

[28] J. Fay, Kernel functions, analytic torsion and moduli spaces, *Mem. Am. Math. Soc.* **96** (1992).

[29] J. Fay, *Theta Functions on Riemann surfaces*, Springer Lecture Notes 352 (1973).

[30] E. D'Hoker and D. H. Phong, Two-loop superstrings. IV: The cosmological constant and modular forms, *Nucl. Phys.* B **639** (2002), 129-181.

[31] C. L. Siegel, Symplectic Geometry, *Amer. J. Math.* **65** (1943), 1-86

[32] L. Bonora, A. Lugo, M. Matone and J. Russo, A global operator formalism on higher genus Riemann surfaces: b-c systems, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **123** (1989), 329-359.

[33] D. Mumford, Stability of projective varieties, *Enseign. Math.* **23** (1977), 39-110.

[34] A. A. Belavin and V. G. Knizhnik, Algebraic geometry and the geometry of quantum strings, *Phys. Lett.* B **168** (1986), 201-206.

[35] A. A. Beilinson and Y. I. Manin, The Mumford form and the Polyakov measure in string theory, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **107** (1986), 359-376.

[36] L. Alvarez-Gaume, J. B. Bost, G. W. Moore, P. C. Nelson and C. Vafa, Bosonization on higher genus Riemann Surfaces, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **112** (1987), 503-552.

[37] E. P. Verlinde and H. L. Verlinde, Chiral bosonization, determinants and the string partition function, *Nucl. Phys.* B **288** (1987), 357-396.

[38] A. A. Belavin, V. Knizhnik, A. Morozov and A. Perelomov, Two and three loop amplitudes in the bosonic string theory, *Phys. Lett.* B **177** (1986), 324-328.

[39] A. Morozov, Explicit formulae for one, two, three and four loop string amplitudes, *Phys. Lett.* B **184** (1987), 171-176.

[40] E. D'Hoker and D. H. Phong, Asyzygies, modular forms, and the superstring measure. II, *Nucl. Phys.* B **710** (2005), 83-116 [arXiv:hep-th/0411182].